DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 133	24	EA 003 087

AUTHOR	Eckel, Howard
TITLE	Developing and Testing Research Instruments for Role Analysis of Educational Administrators Emphasizing Devices to Study Relationships between Variable Definitions of Educational Administrative Activities, Style, and Norms, and Role Conflict and Ambiguity. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. National Center for Educational Research and Development.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-F-024
PUB DATE	31 Dec 69
GRANT	OEG-6-8-008024-0011(057)
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role, *Principals, *Research Tools, Role Conflict, *Role Theory, *Secondary Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a study to translate, adopt, and extend role theory as related to the secondary school principal; to develop and test instruments, processes, and devices for obtaining and analyzing role theory variables; and to generate hypotheses concerning the principal within a role analytical framework. A series of hypotheses are presented with limited case description support for each; the concept of "institutional role sets" and a process of recruitment, preparation, and inservice education are discussed. Hypotheses fall into three groups: (1) variables operating to shape the relationship between the principal and his role set and corresponding influences on his role; (2) cultural, societal, historical, and organizational factors; and (3) the reality of the principal's role strain. Appendixes include interview schedules, lists of persons interviewed, and references and a bibliography. (LLR)

ED0 43133

BR. 8-F-024
PA 24
EA

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-F-024
Grant No. OEG-6-8-008024-0011 (057)

DEVELOPING AND TESTING RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS FOR ROLE ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS EMPHASIZING DEVICES TO STUDY RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VARIABLE DEFINITIONS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES, STYLE, AND NORMS, AND ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY

December 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 003 087

+6

ED043133

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-F-024
Grant No. OEG-6-8-008024-0011 (057)

DEVELOPING AND TESTING RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS FOR ROLE ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS EMPHASIZING DEVICES TO STUDY RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VARIABLE DEFINITIONS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES, STYLE, AND NORMS, AND ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY

Howard Eckel

University of Nebraska

Lincoln, Nebraska

December 31, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FOREWARD TO THE STUDY

The use of theories and models for the study of educational administration and as guides for action is well established. The work of leading educational administration theorists has been convincing.

While extensive work has been done in developing the rationale for the use of educational administration theory, limited work has been done in developing and/or adapting specific theories to the field. The purpose of this project was to adapt and translate one theory -- that of role -- to the secondary school in general and to the secondary principal specifically.

The investigator has developed a deep interest in role theory over the past several years. It was initially stimulated by members of an interdisciplinary team of behavioral scientists who served with him in teaching a block-of-time group of school administrators at the University of Kentucky during the summers of 1959 and 1960. He has introduced concepts of the theory in his teaching since the early 1960's.

In 1965 he submitted a proposal to the United States Office of Education for support for an experimental program to use concepts of role as a model for preparing educational administrators. This proposal was approved but was not funded.

Assistance to support this study was obtained from three sources. First, in June 1968 Contract No. OEG-6-8-008-024-0011 (057) was negotiated with the Cooperative Research Branch, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This contract was confined to "Developing and Testing Research Instruments for Role Analysis of Educational Administrators Emphasizing Devices to Study Relationships between Variable Definitions of Educational Administrative Activities, Style, and Norms, and Role Conflict and Ambiguity."

Second, since the intent of the project was to adapt and modify the theory as an intercultural model, the investigator chose to conduct his exploratory study in the English-speaking countries of New Zealand, Australia, England, Scotland, and Ireland. These countries were selected because they were involved in a 1966 International Inter-visitation Program in Educational Administration sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration. Necessary contacts were made with representatives from these countries at that time.

The investigator was successful in obtaining a research leave during the second semester, 1968-69, from his position at the University of Nebraska to conduct the foreign portion of the study.

A third source of assistance was a $1,000 international study award from Phi Delta Kappa based upon the study plan.

This study is intended to set the ground work for additional theory development, hypothetical generation and researchers in educational administration within the role framework.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator is indebted to the University of Nebraska officials for their support of the research reported in this document. The Dean of Teachers College, Walter Beggs, and the Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration, Dale Hayes, supported the proposal and assisted in freeing ample time in which to conduct the research. Also, appreciation is due Dr. Francis Schmehl, Research Administrator, and the Research Council of the University of Nebraska for granting the investigator released time to conduct the foreign portion of the study.

In early 1969, Phi Delta Kappa awarded the investigator one of four $1,000 international study grants based upon the international portion of the reported study. A debt of gratitude is due the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on International Education for this assistance.

Five persons were especially helpful as project advisors and critics of the tentative project report. Professors of Educational Administration Dale Bolton of the University of Washington and Richard Lonsdale of New York University served as advisors concerning the relationship of role theory and educational administration. Dr. Art Gallaher, Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Center for Developmental Change, University of Kentucky, and Dr. Robert Kahn, Professor of Social Psychology, University of Michigan, served as advisors relative to the technical aspects of the theory as used by behavioral scientists. Dr. Charles Neidt, Director of the Human Factors Research Laboratory at Colorado State University assisted in a variety of ways but especially on research methodology.

Finally a debt of appreciation is due my wife, Lois, for her editorial assistance and to Luise Berner for both typing and editing the manuscript.

Howard Eckel

SUMMARY

There is a rapidly accelerating need to develop and promote innovative patterns of educational leadership. The current system of recruitment, selection, preparation, and in-service is generally out-dated in our rapidly changing world.

One factor limiting change in educational leadership is the absence of comprehensive holistic theoretical models which provide direction and priorities in the educational administrative process. Accelerated research effort is needed to create or adopt appropriate theoretical models.

Role theory is a widely accepted framework for the analysis of social systems by the various branches of the behavioral sciences. The theory provides for the major variables in educational organization and educational leadership. It has breadth yet it provides structure for definitive studies. Concepts of self, others, and cultural and organizational norms are interrelated in its premises. It is useful both in analyzing what exists and in projecting what changes are possible and how these may be instigated.

The purpose of this project was to (1) translate, adopt, and extend the theory as it relates to the secondary school principalship; (2) conduct an exploratory study on the development of instruments, processes, and devices by which role theory variables relative to the principal can be obtained and analyzed; (3) generate pertinent role theory hypotheses about the status of the principalship; and (4) support these hypotheses so far as the exploratory study would permit. The study was conducted on an international sample so that contrasting data could be used and in order that the model could be developed as an intercultural analytical system.

The investigator relied upon semi-structured interviews to collect relevant data. The use of a hypothesis formulation process and the application of the grounded theory technique developed and described by Glaser and Strauss helped keep hypothetical possibilities open and aided the investigator in theory extensions.

Three types of findings are reported. First, a series of twenty-six interrelated hypotheses are presented with limited case description support data for each. Second, the role theory extension concept of "Institutional Role Sets" is described and discussed; and third, a process of recruitment, preparation, and in-service education is discussed within the modified theoretical framework.

Three clusters of hypotheses are included in the report. The first group deals with variables which operate to shape the relationship between the principal and his role set and the influence which each has upon his role. Variables considered are the content of the superordinate's role; the relative power of the principal and the superordinate; the nature of teacher subgroups; the extent to which teachers rely on inter-system teachers unions; the function of parents and third parties as supporters of student

power; and certain variables associated directly with the incumbent principal such as his personal value system and other roles simultaneously occupied by him.

The second group of hypotheses relates to culture, societal, historical, and organizational factors. Included are considerations of religion; economic and governmental systems; degree of urbanization; the educational tradition; the pattern for dividing students for purposes of education; the nature of the educational unit; internal school factors; and the relative prestige of the principal.

The third group of hypotheses pertains to the reality of the principal's role strain. It is hypothesized that the principal manipulates his environment to prevent role strain or to reduce it. As external power shifts, he accommodates these shifts in his principalship behavior. Also, physical and psychological derivatives of strain tend to be contagious and even rewarded in a high strain society.

In the process of applying role analytical procedures in studying the principalship across cultural lines, certain limitations of the theory became evident. Problems of ambiguity emerged from traditional concepts of boundry roles and third parties. Therefore, role analysis was extended in this study to include "Institutional Role Sets." The position is taken that interdependent institutions such as families, businesses, industries, and schools interact similar to patterns of individual interaction as conceptualized by role theory. Institutions, therefore, have certain expectations of other institutions just as individuals have certain expectations of other individuals. It is, therefore, believed that many role relationships are clarified by viewing the secondary school as a "focal institution" surrounded by a number of interdependent institutions which make up their institutional role set.

Given the above stated hypotheses and an expanded role analytical model including institutional role sets, a projected preparation program is outlined. Central to the recruitment and preparation plan is that the source for the school's direction is in the larger culture. The specific direction for school change is communicated to the school through its institutional role set. The principal's most important function is to receive communications from these other institutions about schools and to transmit school expectations to these other institutions. The purpose of recruitment, preparation and continuing education is to orient principals to behave accordingly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Forward to the Study iii

Acknowledgements v

Summary vii

Chapter 1 - The Study 1
  Introduction 1
  Methods of Analyzing the Educational Administrator's Job 1
  Purpose of the Project 3
  Project Problems and Delimitations 4
    Study Procedure 5
    Preparation for the Researcher 7
    The Selection of Subjects 8

Chapter II - Role Theory, A Common Language of the Social Sciences . . 10
    Role Analysis and the Study of Educational Administration 17

Chapter III - Role Theory, Applications to the Secondary School Principal 19
    The Secondary Principal - The Focal Role 19
    The "Self" in Role Analysis 20
    Secondary School Principal's Role Set 22
    The Secondary School Principal's Superordinate 23
    Teachers 25
    Students 28
    Parents 30
    The Principal's Family 31
    Other Members of the Role Set 32
    Cultural, Societal, Historical, and Organizational Factors 32
    Role Strain 38

Chapter IV - Role Theory, Hypotheses, Theory Extension and Preparation Applications Relative to Secondary School Principals . . 42
  Part 1 - Hypotheses 42
  Part 2 - Institutional Role Sets 46
    Institutional Focal Role -- The Secondary School 48
    The Secondary School's Institutional Role Set 49
  Part 3 - Preparation Applications 50

Chapter V -- Role Theory, Conclusions and Related Activities 54
    Related Activities 55

Appendix A - Interview Schedules 57

Appendix B - Listing of Persons Interviewed and Their Locations . . . 60

Appendix C - References and Bibliography 64

Appendix D - Copyright Permission 72

CHAPTER I -- THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Since 1950 there have been increasing efforts to develop knowledge about educational administration. The foundation work was done through the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration[1] and continued in the late 1950's and early 60's by other agencies and institutions.

The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, beginning in 1947, has produced professional literature and supported research efforts in this field. The University Council for Educational Administration, beginning in the late 50's, continues to stimulate coordinated research, experimentation and concept development among its fifty-eight member institutions.

During the late 1950's the view emerged that much of the research and literature concerning effective administrative behavior was fragmentary and lacked an integrating model or theoretical base. The emphasis during the past ten years has been on developing a rationale and support for the use of theory in the study of educational administration.[2] Now that this approach is widely accepted, it seems possible and desirable to adapt and utilize certain broad theories for the purpose of research in administrative behavior. An important dimension of the proposed project is to refine and utilize a specific analytical framework for the study of educational administrative behavior.

METHODS OF ANALYZING THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S JOB

If one assumes that the professional behavior of the educational administrator -- what he does and how he spends his time -- has a crucial impact upon the educational process, then it becomes important to concern ourselves with administrative behavioral patterns. Studies of the administrator's job or his behavior may take one of at least four foci.

First, the investigator can, through various techniques, describe or define what the job is -- or historically, what it was. He may use general observations, questionnaires, cases, or study reports as sources of data. In this approach, data are divided into subdivisions such as administrative behavior in the community, with teachers, and with students; or the divisions may be expressed as intra-organizational or inter-organizational behavior; or it may be studied as behavior focused on meeting organizational goals as contrasted with meeting individual needs. Studies of this type are usually taxonomies -- logical divisions of a number of identifiable variables. They are generally "status" studies in that they stress administrative behavior as it is or was. Investigators applying this approach frequently use their own frame of reference to analyze their findings and to make recommendations. Carefully constructed taxonomies are useful in understanding the administrative process and as data for theory construction.

---

[1] Holles Moore, "A Report on CPEA," Studies in School Administration, (American Association of School Administrators, Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, Washington, D. C., 1957).

[2] Daniel Griffith, Administrative Theory (New York: Appleton, Century and Crofts, 1959), p. 123.

A second way the investigator can study educational administration is to analyze current behavioral patterns and predict future directions through an investigation of certain societal forces. He attempts to predict the type, direction, and intensity of job change by studying movements and events in the larger society. He may be interested in possible consequences evolving from events such as professional negotiations, the court's decisions about student rights and segregation, or federal and state financial support of education. Those who investigate the relationship of social trends and implications for the administrative job continue to make important contributions.

A third way to approach the study is to establish interrelationships (usually statistically) between or among a limited number of well defined interrelated behavior variables. Such studies may include relationships between behavioral variables of the administrator and those of other persons or between those of the administrator and certain organizational or cultural variables.

In this approach, the investigator generally selects definable and manageable variables for which measures are either available or can be readily developed. He attempts to limit or control the most pertinent variables not included in his research. A basic assumption underlying this approach is that the investigator can make certain extensions and generalizations on the basis of establishing covariance relationships among the variables under study.

Statistical studies of selected interrelated variables continue to add knowledge and offer clues for deeper studies. While this approach is especially useful in some instances, frequently results are overly generalized. A position is taken here that depth studies of a select few variables within the context of a broad theory, such as role, do not automatically insure that resulting data will fit or contribute to the broad theory context.

A fourth way that the educational administrative job can be studied grows logically from the limitations of approach three. This approach is to research a number of interrelated organizational and behavioral variables through a systematic framework or theoretical constructs. Because of the interrelatedness of a multi-dimensional theory, its use as a research guide requires that any subdivision of variables can be studied in depth only within the total framework. Very limited theory related generalizations may be made on the basis of depth studies of a limited number of the theory's variables. In this approach, it is even more important to give careful attention to the construction of theory based hypotheses prior to the analytical process.

The first three approaches are relatively simple to manage. Research methodology and instrumentation employed for these approaches are generally established and accepted. The fourth approach embodies new techniques, has few well established guidelines, admits to very limited methodological experience, is less well accepted in a statistically oriented scientific society, and presents few tried and tested instruments for the measurement of pertinent variables. Consequently, this approach deserves concerted study at this time if we are to gain new knowledge. Only when a wide range of variables about the administrative process and behavior are thoroughly understood can the knowledge thus obtained be used intelligently to influence the educational process.

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the proposed project is to develop, apply, and test methods and instruments designed to analyze certain elements of the educational administrative role across cultural lines. Methods and instruments to be developed will consider such variables as: Who influences the shaping of educational administrative behavior? How are "influential others" identified? Is there a changing pattern concerning who influences administrative decisions? What forces cause administrative behavior to continue to function as it has in the past and what causes it to change? How do influential others communicate their wishes to administrators? What degree of freedom does the administrator have to shape his own job description? What are the consequences when two or more important power figures have different views of the administrator's job? What are the behavioral consequences if the views of one or more important figures are in conflict with the personal values of the administrator?

More specifically, the intent of the project is to:

(1) Modify and apply role theory as a framework for the analysis of the educational administrative process. Furthermore, it is the purpose of this project to utilize the theory's application to administrative behavior as a means to refine the theory as presently conceptualized by behavioral scientists.

(2) Develop within the framework of role theory methods, instruments, and techniques by which systematic administrative behavior data can be gathered concerning role sets, role senders, focal persons, self concept, methods for managing role conflict, consequences of conflict, innovative roles, rank and prestige, and organizational norms.

(3) Test methods and instruments described under (2) by applying them on selected secondary school principals in the United States, New Zealand, Australia, England, Ireland, and Scotland.

(4) Generate a system of partially supported hypothetical statements in reference to the secondary school principalship within a role analytical framework.

PROJECT PROBLEMS AND DELIMITATIONS

A number of limiting factors were encountered in the attempt to adopt and develop elements of role theory as a framework for the analysis of educational administrative behavior.

The first limiting factor was that of managing adequate time to conduct the research contracted through this project. While project funds provided for released time, regular responsibilities continued and required greater efforts when the investigator returned to regular duties. While it is possible to be released from certain job responsibilities, many continue and are there when one returns.

A second unanticipated difficulty evolves from an apparent college "norm" about research projects -- especially those which do not apply directly to practice. Both expressed and unexpressed negative attitudes toward an outside supported research project were encountered. One person indicated that such studies are "boondoggles" and that there is obviously little advantage for our American system through studies of international educational systems. This apparent attitude caused a degree of concern.

A third and central limitation is inherent in the difference between the investigator's concepts of research design and those of many of his colleagues. A degree of anxiety was experienced because of this rather sharp deviation between the general approach of this project and his perception of the traditional approach of the social scientist -- including that of the educational researcher.

The "Gestalt" research approach, which simultaneously considers a range of variables, is now gaining greater support because of the growing recognition that many of the most acute problems are not getting proper attention inasmuch as precise measurements are still unavailable. Interpretation and action founded only upon those fragments of the real world which are measurable may be dysfunctional as a guide to behavior. Therefore, the effort here is to construct models and concepts which include a wide range of relationships with only rough measures rather than to devise instruments for only those variables within the whole which are most easily measured by traditional recognized methods.

A fourth limiting factor also relates to research instruments and methods. The plan was based upon the assumption that certain instruments could be borrowed and adapted from education, business, industry, and the behavioral sciences for role analytical purposes. This plan did not prove successful. It was found that data collected on traditional types of role study questionnaires and data learned through depth interviews often have quite different meanings. Also, questionnaires developed and tested for American principals do not have the same meaning for headmasters in other countries. Therefore, as the project developed, it became evident that the most useful data were collected through the interview method; thus pencil and paper devices were discarded for this stage of investigation.

A fifth limiting factor emerged in the process of translating the theory to a workable analytical model for school administrators. More attention was needed on the basic analytical model than had been anticipated. Therefore, greater attention was given to two vital and preliminary steps in a comprehensive role analytical plan. First, greater attention and effort was needed on the extension and modifications of the theory than had been expected. An original major extension was made to the basic theory, applied to administrative behavior and reported in this report.[3] And second, more attention has been given than was first thought necessary to hypothesis development suggested by the role analysis study.

Study Procedure

The study procedure can be divided into six separate phases.

Phase one was devoted to a thorough investigation of the literature relative to role theory. A comprehensive bibliography was developed from items listed on role, pages 383-429, Role Theory Concepts and Research by Biddle and Thomas (editors) and the Readers Guide. This bibliography was scanned and items worthy of additional study were xeroxed and kept for constant reference. A bibliography of items used in the investigation is included in Appendix C.

The second phase of the project was to prepare from the literature an outline of relevant role concepts. These concepts were later prepared in written form and are incorporated in Chapter II of this document.

Phase three in the study procedure was to establish the research design and approach. At this point, it was decided to include (1) a specific device to determine sources of teacher and headmaster conflict, and (2) an interview technique to validate data collected on the questionnaire and to explore broad general questions concerning role sets, conflict and its resolution, and role strain and its resolution. A copy of the interview schedule is included in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was deleted because of: (1) inconsistencies in the data collected by questionnaire and the data obtained in interviews; (2) evidence of resistance to paper and pencil instruments abroad; and (3) some evidence that cultural norms accounted for certain responses rather than role. In the investigator's judgment, there are serious limitations to the use of such instruments for role analysis data.

---

[3] See Institutional Role Sets, Chapter IV, page 46.

The interview method was relied upon for collecting role analytical data. Both principals in the United States and headmasters abroad have shown high levels of cooperation and honesty throughout interviews.

The interview process was based upon two research approaches. First, that in which the investigator focused on three broad areas. As earlier described, the areas included were: (1) the identification and analysis of the influence of members of the principal's role set; (2) the description of inter-sender and person-sender conflict; and (3) the nature, sources and resolution of role strain. The interviews were guided to cover these three major areas. This was accomplished by directing the interviews to the point that major questions were fully explored. The interview framework is discussed in greater detail in Appendix A.

The second basic approach was the utilization of hypotheses formulization interview procedure. This is an interview guide for directing questions. In the process of the interview, attempts were made to formulate hypotheses which were tested by further questioning. Rather than settle on inflexible questions, new questions were suggested from past responses. New hypotheses were constantly set forth which might better explain the major central questions relating to role analysis.[4]

The fourth phase of the project was the study. A total of eighty-seven interviews were conducted: twelve in New Zealand, thirty in Australia, four in Hong Kong, eleven in England, seven in Scotland, six in Ireland and seventeen in the United States. The names of principals and their school systems and other major agencies in which persons were interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

Immediately following each interview, the investigator dictated his findings within the framework already discussed.

In the fifth phase of the study, the data collected was analyzed through the careful study of dictated and transcribed interview notes. The procedure discussed by Glaser and Strauss in The Discovery of Grounded Theory was adapted and utilized as a procedure for hypotheses generation. An attempt was made to "discover theory from data". The result is called "grounded theory". The process here varies somewhat from that used by Glaser in that the scope of investigation is predetermined by data within a broad theory, while Glaser speaks of "discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research."[5] Glaser makes a case for theorizing which focuses upon data in creative ways rather than limiting the approach to predetermined guides. In a sense, the approach is one of using as a central procedure that of attending to all data, including that which is surprising or unanticipated. The theory extension concept of "institutional role sets" discussed in Chapter IV is considered a "grounded theory" development.

---

[4] The hypothesis technique is discussed in Development and Evaluation of a Selection Interviewing Technique, the American Society for Personnel Administration by Charles O. Neidt, Brian C. Arnold, and James L. Sheard.

The sixth and final phase of the project was to write the report which has been divided into five sections. Chapter I includes the rationale, purpose, procedure, problems, and delimitations of the study project. Chapter II discusses role theory and the rationale for the utilization of role analysis in educational administration. Chapter III deals with the secondary school principalship within the role theory framework. Chapter IV (a) sets forth a number of broad hypothetical statements emerging from the investigation, (b) discusses an original modification and extension of the theory and (c) analyzes concepts of recruitment and selection, preparation, and continuing education within the modified framework, and Chapter V discusses a proposed extension and refinement of role theory and a statement on summary and conclusions.

Preparation for the Researcher

The research method adopted in this project is between the specificity of objective questionnaire studies and an open, all-inclusive research approach. The first system requires careful attention to the reliability and validity of objective instruments while the second behooves the researcher to prepare himself to behave objectively and openly in the collection and analysis of the data which he seeks.

While the research done in this study is more specific than that of the anthropologist, it is much less specific than objective statistical studies. It does, therefore, require a research frame of reference similar to that utilized by the antropologist. Hence, the investigator found it necessary to prepare himself similarly to that of anthropological researchers.

People from all cultures tend to be ethnocentric and role centric using their own culture and their specific roles as the measuring device for all other cultures. It is held here that intercultural studies have had little impact on our own system because they represent analyses based upon ethnocentric and role centric foundations or, on the other extreme, they compare only limited and isolated variables.

Since a basic position of this study is that role theory is to be used as the model for analysis, personal preparation required that the investigator (1) learn not only to know and understand role theory but to think and live within the model during interviews, and (2) hold in abeyance personal value judgments about the adequacy or inadequacy or comparisons of people and systems being studied. The investigator prepared himself to be as non-judgmental as possible during the interviews and in the analysis of data.

---

[5] Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967), p. 2. See Appendix D.

It is one thing to develop cognitive learnings about role; it is quite another thing to create objective devices which presumably analyze in depth a limited number of role variables. It takes a much different ability, skill and orientation to learn to think and live the "theory" in one's interactions with others. To prepare for this, the investigator attempted to become increasingly conscious of his own role relationships and to analyze a wide range of human interactions within the role framework. Also, he attempted to explain relationships rather than to judge them.

No claim is made that the investigator did or can eliminate consciously or unconsciously the habit of judging people and systems on the basis of his own cultural norms, values and roles. However, the position is taken that valuable, unique, new knowledge can be generated from a system requiring the investigator to view himself as an important variable in the process of learning and creating.

The Selection of Subjects

Because of the exploratory nature of the study, no attempt was made to develop a highly structured approach for the selection of secondary principals for study. An attempt was made to include schools in larger population concentrations. The reason for this criterion was that it best represents the type of secondary schools in which most youth will be educated in the future.

Another criterion for selection was that schools chosen be comprehensive and co-educational since these schools represent the dominant trend in secondary education throughout the English-speaking world. In order to develop a feel for contrast, however, some single-sex grammar schools were included.

The number of subjects scheduled for interviews was determined by anticipating the number beyond which little new significant information would be added by additional interviews. Due to the problem of contacts, it was, of course, necessary to estimate the appropriate number for any one country. Interviews with university professors and state agencies also helped to determine if data collected were accurate and sufficient.

The investigator's contacts in countries outside of the United States was a controlling factor. School visitations and interviews within these schools were more difficult to arrange and generally required the help of high educational officials.

Overall, thirty school principals, twenty-seven persons in fourteen post secondary institutions, twenty-eight state agency personnel in ten state agencies, and four local school authorities are included in the study. Also, a number of teachers, students, and parents were included both formally and informally. A list of secondary principals and names of agencies included in the study can be found in Appendix B.

All formal interviews were from one to three hours in length. Interviews with principals lasted from two to three hours. It became possible to shorten interviews as the study progressed and central issues could be approached more directly.

CHAPTER II -- ROLE THEORY

A COMMON LANGUAGE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Chapter II is a general description of role theory as described by social scientists. No attempt is made in this chapter to translate the concepts to that of educational administration or to expand or modify the theory itself. This will be done in Chapters III and IV.

Role theory is a system by which the behavioral scientist attempts to explain the interaction of various individuals within their social setting. Banton says that "Every society . . . can be viewed as a division of labor suited to its environment. Particular members are given their task to perform on behalf of the group. Norms as to proper behavior in given circumstances are established, and sanctions are developed to reward people for worthy conduct and punish them for deviations."[1]

For every position within the social system, there are a number of "_significant others_" or incumbents in closely related positions who are interdependent with a particular actor (_focal role_). The way in which the major significant others (_role set_) define the focal actor's role greatly influences the way he fulfills his role. One may think of the role system as a net, intersecting knots being incumbents of positions within the social system. The intersections of the net closest to any particular intersection (focal role) may be considered as the focal person's role set. Merton coined the term "role set" to describe the significant others surrounding any particular role.[2] The role set of a role incumbent consists of those persons most dependent upon the focal role's behavior.

The theatre is the basic model from which role theory is derived. From the theatre it borrows the idea that the individual actor slips into a role assigned to him, and as long as he plays his part as determined in the script, the play can proceed as planned. Like the theatre, the model is concerned with the exactness of the script; the extent to which each player must get his cues from other actors; and the degree of freedom he can utilize in playing out his part. He behaves according to the way he views himself in the play, the way in which he sees the total play, and the way he interprets other actors' views of the total play and his particular part in it.

Likewise in social situations, role theory conceptualizes individuals in the social situation as actors who are assigned to play a particular role in the drama of life -- the milieu which we term "society". So long as an individual either can or is willing to "follow the script" as assigned by society, the social situation can proceed according to expectations. In real life, as in the play, actors can modify their parts within the range of their own expectations and of those who have close counter roles.

---

[1] Michael Banton, _Roles_ (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965). See Appendix D.

[2] R. Merton, _Social Theory and Social Structure_ (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), second edition.

The play itself can be compared to the general social situation. This is ". . . a sort of reality agreed upon ad hoc by those who participate in it, or, more exactly, by those who do the defining of the situation. From the viewpoint of the individual participant this means that each situation he enters confronts him with specific expectations and demands of him specific responses to these expectations."[3]

Role theory places strong emphasis upon how a particular role becomes defined and the specific characteristics of the definition. For example: What are the "rights" and "duties" of a particular role incumbent? Who are the persons most influential in defining what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior? What agreement is there between the incumbent's definition of his role and those of his role set? Is there general agreement among role set members about the incumbent's role? How accurate is an incumbent in assessing the definitions of his role held by his role set? To what extent is an incumbent able to modify his own role, either by testing the limits as defined by his role set or by modifying the entire social script? By substituting the school superintendent or principal in the incumbent's position, it becomes obvious that the basic questions expressed in role theory are also those of the educational administrator.

An important aspect of role theory -- but not unique to the theory -- is the embracing of the concept of "self" in analyzing reciprocal actions among persons. Sarbin points out, "A second kind of interaction has been added . . . . which marks role theory as a unique social, psychological formulization, namely, the interaction of role and self."[4] Self, then, has not been deleted from role theory, but has been integrated in a larger set of interactions in a unique way.

While Sarbin gave attention to concepts of self early in role theory development, relatively little attention has been given to this dimension as an integral part of role analysis in subsequent literature. The self may be viewed as the incumbent's frame of reference as he interacts with his counter roles based upon the "values" or the residue of all roles which he has occupied in his personal history. His roles as son, sibling, gang member, school student, church member, male, and husband, plus all other roles he has held, lead him to interact with all counter roles in certain ways. Said another way, a role incumbent is inclined to behave toward new role sets as though their expectations are similar to those of all past role sets. Our values are an accumulation of what past groups have expected of us.

---

[3] Peter L. Berger, Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), p. 94. See Appendix D.

[4] Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory", Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume I, ed. Gardner Lindzey (London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), p. 223. See Appendix D.

A basic premise of role theory is that conflict is a major element in role relationships. The incumbent of any focal position often finds himself "in the middle" between members of his role set, or he experiences self-held expectations differing from those held by members of his role set.

Kahn defines sent role conflict ". . . as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other."[5] He furthermore delineates four types of sent role conflict: intra sender conflict -- different prescriptions and proscriptions from a single member of a role set; inter sender conflict -- opposite pressures from two or more role senders; inter role conflict -- pressures eminating from membership in two or more organizations; and person role conflict -- incongruency between demands of his role set and personal needs and values.

The concept of role ambiguity and its counterparts, objective and subjective ambiguity, has been developed by Kahn and has relevance for the educational administrative process. Kahn says that role ambiguity relates to the availability of role related information. A person obviously cannot take into account information which he does not have or does not understand. Kahn states that, "Objective ambiguity is a condition in the environment; subjective or experienced ambiguity is a state of the person."[6] The concept of ambiguity is closely allied to theories of communications within organizations. Communication breakdown resulting in insufficient information for employees may be an organization block while personal attitudes which prevent employees from using information is a psychological block.

Another role concept which has relevance to schools is that of overload. Role overload according to Kahn is a "condition in which role senders (including the self as a role sender) hold compatible, legitimate expectations of the incumbent to perform a large number of tasks."[7] It may be that all of the expectations are impossible to fulfill and conflict arises when one must establish priorities among the great range of tasks that should be performed. Role overload may result either from a condition in which the incumbent does not have the competency to perform the necessary tasks or it may be that while he does possess adequate ability, the expectations of his role set are impossible to fulfill. Role overload may be self imposed as well as externally imposed by the role set.

In engineering, a stress is any force directed at an object. The effect of this force on an object is called strain and is usually measured in terms of deflection, distortion, or some structural strain. Selye,[8] widely known for his research in organism stress, refers to the damaging stimuli as stressors and to the reaction to agents as stress. This terminology is a considerable deviation from that used in the field of engineering. Goode,[9] however, who has developed a promising theory of role strain and role behavior uses the term in the engineering sense. Since the concept in engineering provides a clear analogy to the biological model and since the engineering terminology is being adapted by scholars in role theory such as Kahn and Goode, it is reasonable in this study to use the engineering terminology.

---

[5] Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, and J. Diedrick Snoek, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 12-22. See Appendix D.

[6] Ibid., p. 19, 20. See Appendix D.

[7] Ibid., p. 20. See Appendix D.

The degree of experienced strain is a function of conditions in the environment and reactions of the individual to stress. If a role incumbent does not have resources available to him, i.e., technical information, facilities, power or time, strain will likely result. It will vary in degree according to the internal reactions of these external conditions.

Goode[10] believes that since conflict is an inherent characteristic of all roles and since the result is role strain, the central dynamics for behavior is the process by which ego resolves role strain.

His theory states that a role incumbent deals with role strain in two different ways. First, he utilizes what control he has in deciding whether he will enter into a role relationship with another. Devices which he may use to evade or control the entry into role relationship are: compartmentalization, delegation, elimination, extension, and intrusion barriers. Goode postulates that organizational structure is such that while an incumbent has only limited control over whether he will or will not enter into a role relationship, he does have certain techniques for determining the degree and extent to which he will enter into this relationship.

The second method for an incumbent to control the role relationship is the degree to which he can manage the nature of the role contract. It can be viewed as a transaction or a bargain similar to that often used for goods and services. An incumbent may attempt to reduce the strain in a situation by getting the best role bargain possible.

There are a number of conditions within a social situation which limit the role bargaining possible to an incumbent. These are: the social position of ego and the social position of alter; content of the performance of ego (mother, nurse, etc.); and the situational urgency or crisis.

Several conditions enter into setting the role price. These are primarily related to: the power of ego to carry out the performance, the judgment as to how much his role partner will punish or reward him for his performance, and the esteem or disesteem with which the peripheral social networks or important reference groups (third parties) will respond to both ego's performance and to alter's attempt to make ego perform adequately.

---

[8] Hans Selye, The Stress of Life (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956).

[9] W. J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, 25, 1960, pp. 483-496.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

An important aspect of role theory -- as is true of all theories -- is the specificity by which its various concepts can be delineated. Role theory has its unique descriptive terminology. Since it is a relatively new approach for analyzing social systems, there is confusion concerning terminology. In some cases, different terms are used for the same concept while in other instances the same term is applied to different concepts. Part of the problem is that concepts have not yet been adequately sharpened to have common meaning. For our purpose, terms are used which have the widest use so long as their meanings are sharp and clear.

All social systems may be viewed as schemes for the division of labor. Within this system are a number of positions. A position (within the system) can be described apart from and independent of one who serves in the position. When we refer to the "rights" and "obligations" of a person who occupies a certain position, we are talking of role. This focal person is expected to behave in certain ways and he may also expect others in related positions to act in reference to him in certain ways.

An actor in even the simplest social system occupies a number of roles, many of which may be largely overlapping. When his major roles are consistent one with another, we say they are congruent. If inconsistent, they are incongruent and may result in inter role conflict. For example, if a man's employment requires night work but his wife expects him to be with his family in the evenings, conflict results. The action which one takes to resolve this conflict is his resolution.

A number of terms have been invented to further delineate roles. Latent roles refer to those which are suppressed while another role is being expressed. Pervasive roles are those which condition the manner in which all other roles are enacted. Limited roles are played only in specific situations and are then dropped. A similar categorization developed by Banton includes: basic roles which cannot be separated from others (sex role); general roles which are interrelated but may be separated to some degree (occupational role); and independent roles which may be isolated from other roles (recreational). A boundary role or position is one in which some members of the focal person's role set are outside of the social system under consideration.

Concepts relating to the focal person's perception and action are also relevant to this project. Role centrism means that the focal person's view of his own role determines the way he perceives and evaluates the roles of others. Coping technique refers to the way which one deals with conflict. For example, withdrawal is a common coping technique.

There are terms relevant to the expectations of a focal role held by role set members. Proscriptions refer to taboo behavior; prescriptions are behaviors expected of another while evaluations are judgments of the effectiveness of role behavior. An organizational norm applies to expectations held for all members of an organization whereas a role applies to expectations held for an occupant of a specific position. Power means the extent to which the role sender can get a focal person to do what he wants him to do. Third parties are role senders who set social contract limits between or among persons -- they may influence a focal person indirectly through his role senders.

There has been a considerable discussion on the use of the word "status". Linton said that "a status as distinct from the individual who may occupy it is simply a collection of rights and duties. . . . A role represents the dynamic aspects of a status. . . . When (an individual) puts the rights and duties into effect, he is performing a role."[11] Banton[12] believes that the term status as used by Linton is not adequately different from that of role to make it useful in the analytical system. Banton further believes that Sir Carlton Kempallen, an authority on jurisprudence who defines status as "the condition of belonging to a particular class of persons" which includes class as a fundamental concept in legal usgage, has a much more useful term concept. The legal term recognizes two dimensions, the horizontal characterization of particular roles and their vertical ordering in general categories having distinctive claims upon other people.

Roles may be categorized according to prestige. A person who occupies a particular role will possess a certain level of prestige in relation to persons occupying other roles in the social system. Esteem refers to how well a person gains recognition in terms of how well he fulfills his various roles. Therefore, prestige refers to role while esteem refers to a person within the role. There is often confusion since a person may have high esteem in a particular role, even though he performs this role poorly, because he brings into the role a certain prestige surplus from other roles.

Kahn[13] in his study of organizational stress expands role theory by further delineating concepts and definitions. For example, he distinguishes objective environment -- real objects and events -- and psychological environment -- the conscious and unconscious representation of the objective environment. Office is "a unique point in organizational space". He describes role as associated office activities which are defined as potential behavior. Role set is a web of offices with variable distance and influence upon a focal office but all of which do influence the focal position. Kahn uses role expectations as those prescriptions and proscriptions held by members of a role set. He refers to members of a role set as role senders, and to their communicated expectations as the sent role. Received role is the message which the focal person receives from role senders. The numerous acts which make up the process of role sending constitutes role pressure. The sum of psychological forces on the focal person caused by role pressure is called role focus.

---

[11] Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936). See Appendix D.

[12] Banton, op, cit., p. 27.

[13] Kahn, op. cit.

Frank[14] has attempted to relate three ideal types of administrative organizations with the speed of social change. The three types are (1) underdefined in which role expectations of administrative behavior are not well spelled out; (2) well defined in which administrative roles are explicitly and coherently defined; and (3) over defined in which role expectations cannot be satisfied by role incumbents. Frank therefore disregards the popular distinction of formal and informal organizations and substitutes the three types of roles indicated above. His concept may be helpful in examining the administrative role in educational organizations and the speed of change within the organization.

Extensive work has been documented in the area of role theory which supports the proposed project through applications to educational administrative organization in general and to the school superintendency in particular. For example, Erving Goffman in Presentation of Self in Everyday Life has given extensive detail to role theory and has made clear its application in many everyday situations.[15] Neil Gross has made considerable impact on the field through the use of role theory in studies of the school superintendency and principalship.[16] Sarbin[17] and Biddle[18] have clarified and extended the basic concept.

The U. S. Office of Education has supported role theory as a framework for the analysis of educational administrative positions. Much of Gross' work on administrative roles grew from his study of the school superintendency in Massachusetts and his subsequent U. S. Office supported study of the school principalship.[19] Bills' and Willson's Cooperative Research study in West Virginia concerning change in administrative roles,[20] and Sweitzer's Cooperative Research project, Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals, will serve as important resources for this project.[21] Biddle's Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher[22] will contribute to its basic theoretical foundations.

---

[14] A. G. Frank, "Administrative Role Definition and Social Change," Human Organization, 22, 1964, pp. 238-242.

[15] Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Center, 1958).

[16] Neil Gross, The Role of the Elementary Junior High and Senior High School Principal, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1960-63).

[17] Sarbin, op. cit.

[18] Bruce Biddle, et. al. Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions. Vol. D - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. (Columbia: Social Psychology Laboratory, the University of Missouri, January, 1962).

[19] Gross, op. cit.

Role Analysis and the Study of Educational Administration

There are at least six reasons why role analysis may prove to be a useful model for developing research design in educational administration.

Role theory is comprehensive. The theory is adequately broad to deal with educational administrative behavior as a Gestalt including the "self" of the administrator, the expectations of others -- board members, other administrators, teachers, and parents -- and the social setting -- the community, state, nation, and world. The analytical model allows stress on interrelationships among the whole rather than intensive attention to subdivisions. For example, in role analytical terms, one cannot deal with educational administrative change on the job without considering the community and the impact of the community upon the administrator. While theories designed to advance knowledge are justified in limiting themselves to only certain phenomena, educational administration and the process of developing and improving it must operate within a global holistic type of theory. It is believed that role theory is of this type.

Even though role theory is very broad, it has been adequately delineated so that one may deal with certain well defined variables such as the expectations of others, self expectations, role consensus, and role conflict.

Role theory is interdisciplinary. According to Sarbin, role theory is an "interdisciplinary theory in that its variables are drawn from studies of culture, society, and personality." Since the theory deals with ". . . role, the unit of culture; position, the unit of society; and self, the unit of personality,"[23] it involves most fields of the human sciences. It is a promising model because of its wide use by the behavioral sciences -- psychology, anthropology, sociology, and political science. Most of the concepts, theories, and researches growing out of the social sciences can be integrated into the over-all role theory model. In this way, new knowledge, developed both inside and outside of the field of educational administration, becomes immediately available in usable form. Such concepts as social organization and structure, decision making, theories of personality, and theories of change can well be explained in the broader concepts of the theory.

---

[20] Robert E. Bills, An Assessment of Role Change. West Virginia Department of Education and West Virginia County School Superintendents, 1959 to 1960 (West Virginia, Department of Education, 1961).

[21] Robert E. Sweitzer, Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals. (Stillwater, Oklahoma: Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, January 1963).

[22] Bruce Biddle, Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict and the Role of the Teacher. Volume B - "Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher." (Columbia: Social Psychology Laboratory, the University of Missouri, June, 1961).

[23] Sarbin, op. cit., p. 223. See Appendix D.

Role theory accommodates desired change. Even though the theory does not embrace the "ought" as a basic premise but rather as a variable, certain value questions or purposes can be built into its concept. For example, if it is decided that role redefinition, examination, and enlargement are important, role theory can help explain how this direction might be taken; or if one were to decide that the school administrator ought to be an innovator, it can help explain the general conditions for innovation as well as how such conditions might be obtained.

Role theory provides alternative foci. Within the concept, a number of various research avenues may be taken in the study of educational administrative behavior. For example, emphasis can be focused on self concept, social position, the social context, specific counter roles, role conflict, role consensus, and many other aspects. The use of the theory as a model for researching educational administrative behavior opens research avenues not generally included in traditional research designs.

Role theory is familiar to the field. The theory includes many of the basic categories in which the profession of educational administration is concerned, even though it is generally expressed by the behavioral sciences in more precise terms. For example, in the profession we speak of the administrative role, public expectations, pressure groups, and power individuals, which are roughly comparable to the terminology of role theory. Role theory then, while couched in somewhat different terms, is not foreign to the profession of educational administration.

Role theory provides for two-way communication. Not only does the use of the theory serve as a bridge for introducing concepts from other disciplines, it also provides a channel through which new knowledge from educational administration may be conveniently communicated to the behavioral sciences. In this sense, it becomes the common language for intercommunication.

Role theory may serve as an intercultural comparative framework. One purpose of the project was to develop and refine a framework which could be utilized in the analysis of certain educational positions across cultural lines. Many comparative educational frameworks used have tended to give depth attention to limited subsystems or have permitted such broad investigation that comparative data had little meaning. It is believed that role analysis gives focus and direction while still including a wide range of elements in the total system.

CHAPTER III -- ROLE THEORY

APPLICATIONS TO THE SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Chapters I and II of this report discuss the evolution of educational administration investigation, a rationale for studying the process within the context of a theoretical framework, arguments for the use of role theory in analyzing educational administration positions, and a general discussion of role theory as delineated by behavioral scientists. This section of the report will translate role theory as it applies to educational administrative process with special emphasis upon the secondary school principal. Illustrations drawn from cultures and educational organizations studied are used to clarify role theory concepts as applied to educational administration and to serve as minimal supporting data for hypotheses outlined in Chapter IV.

The major topics being used to describe the principalship in role analytical terms are the logical subdivisions of the theory itself. These are: (1) The Secondary Principal -- The Focal Role, (2) The "Self" in Role Analysis, (3) Role Set, (4) Superordinates, (5) Teachers, (6) Parents, (7) Students, (8) Families, (9) Other Role Set Members, (10) Cultural and Organizational Factors, and (11) Stress and Strain.

The Secondary Principal - The Focal Role

The "office" or "position" of the secondary principal is the focal role for analysis. The position itself just as any other "division of labor" post within an organization can be described independently of and apart from the incumbent. The principal's "rights" and "obligations" -- his role -- are a function of the general norms of several environments. These include norms of the larger school system, norms of the subsystem of the incumbent's school, "expectations" of his role set, and the expectations which he holds for himself. The expression of a person within a principalship is his role behavior.

The role of the secondary principalship within a particular culture, and also across cultural lines, have both common and unique characteristics. In the United States, principals are generally expected to practice an open-door policy with teachers and students. In New Zealand and Australia, they are also expected to counsel with teachers when the need arises but teachers are generally expected to take problems first to department heads. In the United States, they are expected to insure that religious education not be included in the school program, while in New Zealand the headmaster must provide religious education.

The principalship is a general role. That is, role senders in his non-principalship roles tend to interrelate to him on the basis of their perception of appropriate principalship behavior. There develops a generalized set of expectations for him within his community regardless of whether he is functioning in his principalship role, or his church role, consumer role, family role, etc. In America, nearly everyone feels obliged to let the school administrator know what is expected of him. Parents in the United States are much more active role senders than in other cultures studied.

There is a high level of interdependence among various division of labor positions, and so it is with secondary school principals. Those who are located in the network of positions directly dependent upon the role of the principal (his role set) will hold an idealized pattern of role behavior for him -- role prescriptions and proscriptions. Conversely, the principal must depend upon certain role related behavior from members of his role set if he is to fulfill his role adequately. How well the principal performs in the judgment of the role senders is their evaluation of him.

Consider an example of role interdependence. Teachers in America expect the principal to support them in confrontations with parents. If he fulfills this expectation to their satisfaction, they will evaluate him highly. Conversely, the principal's role set holds him accountable for classroom teaching practices which they believe appropriate. He depends upon the teachers to fulfill these instructional expectations if he is to be evaluated positively. Therefore, teachers depend upon the principal for behavior which supports their roles, and likewise the principal depends upon teachers for certain behavior to support his.

The "Self" in Role Analysis

Sarbin[1] and Mead[2] have written on the concept of "self" as it enters into the definition of one's own roles. The self, they say, functions along with role set members in defining the focal person's role. A principal does not enter a position neutral about what the job is but rather he brings with him his perception of the "rights" and "obligations" of the office. He puts into effect behavior which he believes appropriate regardless of whether its source is from personal preference or from what he thinks others expect of him. A new role incumbent is expected to enter a division of labor position with preconceived knowledge of the expectations that go with it.

It is obvious that different people in similar principalship positions behave quite differently. One person may drastically redefine his role, ignoring certain interrelated roles while other incumbents may be highly sensitive to role set members and change the role very little. Although we cannot assume that any two principalships are identically defined or that role set members exhibit the same behaviors, the "person" within the principalship is a highly significant variable when analyzing behavior in the role. His views of himself in relation to others, his feeling of worth, his concept of the evaluation of others, his personal style of behavior, his reaction to various stresses, his personality characteristics, his general orientation toward himself and others, and his view of self as an actor in this position all contribute to this principalship behavior.

---

[1] T. R. Sarbin, "Role Theory" Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume I, ed. Gardner Lindzey (London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 223-258.

[2] G. H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, C. W. Morris, ed., 1934).

The "self" may be viewed as the totality of interactional habits developed from all of one's past and present roles. Values may be seen as generalizations resulting from reinforcement from past experience. For example, if role senders in dominant past roles have communicated evaluations of self-worth to the actor, he will bring this value of self into subsequent roles. If past role senders have communicated and supported values of openness to people, he will most likely reflect such attitudes toward his own role and hold similar expectations for the roles of others.

In role analysis, it is difficult to tell where the "self" leaves off and the influence of others begins. What appears to be the judgment of the principal's "self" may reflect the views of his wife, the next door neighbor, a friend from another profession, a political leader, the communist party, or significant others in his history. To obtain an accurate assessment of role, both the "self" and "others" must be included in the theoretical framework.

The extent to which the "self" contributes to role behavior varies from principal to principal and from situation to situation. Many principals appear to be highly sensitive to their role sets -- their behavior being visibly guided by the desires of others. Educators refer to this other-directed behavior as "political" and such principals are considered to be "organization men".

On the other hand, theories of liberation (Watts), individualization (Jung), self actualization (Maslow), functional autonomy (Allport), and creative selfhood (Adler) postulate a definable self-concept which is relatively independent of the whims of surrounding influencers. These theorists believe that roles do permit greater lattitude than we generally assume. Such persons can, in Watts' term, "outploy" those around them.[3] A vital dimension of role analysis is the yet relatively unexplored concept of self and the extent to which a strong well-integrated purposeful self can actually define role and "outploy" his role set.

Concepts of self couched in role terms are a part of role literature. However, much more attention is given to the influence of "others" on role definition than is given to self-determinants. While role analysis assumes

[3] Alan W. Watts, Psychotherapy, East and West (Pantheon Books, Inc., 1961), p. 107.

an integral interaction of both self and others, process and instruments are designed to deal with one or the other rather than both. The two variables can no more be separated in behavior analysis than can heredity and environment in shaping human beings.[4] Role analysis requires research approaches which deal with both "self" and "others" variables simultaneously.

Secondary School Principal's Role Set

The secondary school principal is the center for many communication channels through which messages are constantly transmitted on proscriptions, prescriptions, and evaluations concerning his role behavior. Some of these messages refer to general cultural norms, i.e., the next door neighbor who monitors his social behavior. Or they may carry messages about the norms of the school organization in which he works, i.e., appropriate dress and grooming. Others are messages relative to his personal history. Among the vast numbers of messages, there are a limited number originating from influential persons with high role dependency upon his behavior.

One should not infer, however, that all channels of communication are open to the school principal. It is possible that some messages from less influential sources "get through" more effectively than do messages from more influential sources. Unless the principal is insightful, he may overly react to clear messages from relatively insignificant sources and under-react to weak messages from significant sources. Kahn uses the term "ambiguity" to describe a situation in which sent role messages from important sources do not get properly communicated to the focal role. The principal may find himself in deep trouble when sources of weak messages prove to be the most influential in evaluating his role behavior.

A preliminary observation is that well established, stable schools of other countries studied have few problems with ambiguity as a source of strain. The principal learns various school roles as he progresses through the ranks. He can be quite certain that the organizational structure has changed little since he occupied roles now occupied by members of his own role set. If his role behavior is consistent with than enacted by his own former headmaster, his behavior will probably be accepted.

The United States principal, however, does have problems of ambiguity. First, he encounters a profession in which traditional behavior is not so highly respected and new patterns are desired. Second, his role is much more diverse than in most other countries. Many counter roles enter into defining his role. Third, there are more role behavior models being proposed for the principal in the United States. This results in ambiguity and confusion. With many roles confronting him, it becomes difficult to sort out the most important voices. Role senders, superintendents for example, sometimes have the attitude that it is undemocratic to communicate their wishes clearly and sharply to the principal. They feel he should be free to design his own role. However, even though communication is unclear, the principal will still be evaluated according to the expectations of the superordinate.

---

[4] Theodosius Dobzhansky, The Biological Basis of Human Freedom (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).

What people comprise the secondary principal's role set? The only way to be sure is to study the unique pattern for each principal. Role sets vary from school to school within a culture, and certainly between schools across cultural lines. Principals may rely heavily upon wives, family members, non-educational friends, educational leaders, principals in other schools, or retired school personnel. The membership of role sets in the United States tends to be different from that in other countries studied. Here, professors in preparation programs and other professional groups have more influence on a principal than elsewhere. The variations in role sets are very important factors in a role analytical model.

Not only do role sets vary, but the effect of each role sender's messages varies considerably. In some instances, messages of school superintendents in the United States may be a significant force in defining the principal's role, while in others the principal is quite insensitive to these sent roles. While the pattern in most other English-speaking countries also varies, the headmaster appears to be relatively independent of his organizational superordinate.

Even though the constituency of role sets varies from role to role, it is possible to generalize about those usually included in the secondary principal's role set. Significant role senders for most principals, both in the United States and elsewhere, include: (1) a superordinate -- superintendent of schools in the United States, and director of education in other countries studied; (2) teachers; (3) students; and (4) parents.

The Secondary School Principal's Superordinate

While the relationship between the principal and his superordinate varies from school to school and from country to country, all principals do function in relationship to a superordinate. In the United States, it is the superintendent of schools. In New Zealand and Australia, it is the Director General of Education; and in England, it is the local authority or County Director of Education.

At least three variables operate in establishing the superordinate's influence in the principal's role definition. First is the content of the superordinate's role. This content determines the degree to which he will exert pressure upon the principal. His role definition may be to leave the principal's role definition to others in the system, including the principal himself. Such attitudes are expressed by "I expect the principal to run his own school." On the other hand, if the superordinate's role is that of one who closely supervises, a maximum degree of influence will be experienced.

Variations in the content of the superordinate's role in reference to that of the principal have many sources. The superordinate's philosophical position concerning the autonomy of both parties affects the part that he plays in defining the principal's role. Organizational factors help determine the extent to which the principal is obliged to be sensitive to the superordinate. In New South Wales, Australia, all teachers are assigned to secondary schools by the Office of the Director of Education. Thus, the quality of the relationship between principal and Director can affect the quality of the school staff. Also, in New South Wales, advancement may come through recommendations from school inspectors who evaluate the schools -- and thus indirectly evaluate the principal. On the other hand, in Glasgow, Scotland, principals are appointed primarily on the basis of tenure and this practice is protected by teachers' groups. In this instance, principals may feel quite independent concerning the wishes of the Director's Office.

Other factors which shape the superordinate's role toward principals are: role set, prevalent practices in other school systems, and the relative influence each has on key role senders.

A second variable relating to the influence of the superordinate on the principal's role definition is that of geographical and psychological distance. Several studies suggest that there is an inverse relationship between the geographical distance from the school to the superordinate's office and the influence which the superordinate exerts. Psychological distance refers to the closeness of relationship between the two incumbents. While close contacts may not necessarily mean that either is influencing the role of the other, psychological withdrawal results in role ambiguity and increased communication problems.

A third variable conditioning the superordinate's influence on the principal's role is that of the relative power of the two positions. While the superordinate's position by tradition and definition carries greater power than that of the principal's, this is not always true. Either party may bring to his own role "surplus" prestige acquired from other community roles, i.e., businessman, land owner, or man of wealth. With this surplus prestige pressure can be applied with much greater effect than would otherwise be possible.

The lengths of tenure of the two parties affect the extent to which the superordinate can intercede. Principals with long tenure in large systems are relatively independent. Also, a new superordinate may have little influence on a principal who has served many years and has developed prestige and esteem in his offices. Associations of the principal may also serve to limit the influence of the superordinate. Friendships which he has with influential parents or membership in community organizations can serve to buffer efforts of the superordinate to influence his role.

While the superordinate's influence varies from place to place and time to time, it is a significant force in all systems studied. According to Dodd,

> "The administrators form . . . a group with whom the principal must deal and one that exerts authority over him. Since both the administrators' formal approval and their informal support are vital to the principal, their expectations assume critical importance for him. However, . . . his superordinates are seldom present and his actions are not immediately visible to them. The reduced visibility may tend to decrease the salience of the administrator's expectations and gives the principal room to maneuver . . . The principal may perceive varying expectations from the higher administration or he may not perceive any specific expectations. Where the expectations are clearly expressed as in memorandum or telephone calls, he has little choice but to meet them since the sanctions for failing to do so are overwhelming."[5]

Teachers

The teachers constitute another very important significant others for the secondary school principal's role. Dodd says the teachers are probably the most important group that affects the principal's behavior.[6] Even though they are subordinate to the principal in the organization, they wield powerful sanctions. Headmasters and principals explained that they were once teachers so continue to identify with them. They feel strain if their own behavior is negatively evaluated by teachers and they are sensitive to their sanctions. Decisions are made with the desires of the teachers in mind.

The degree of influence which teachers have on the principal's role definition is determined in part by the school system's organizational and operational patterns. For example, in New Zealand the principal generally recommends teachers for employment but has no procedure for their release or reassignment. He also has unlimited tenure. There is little evidence that either the principal or the teachers make efforts to alter the traditional behavioral patterns of the other. The principal expresses the belief that teachers know their job and should not be closely supervised. Teachers expect the principal to know his job and do not question his role. In New South Wales, Australia where teachers are assigned positions from the state level, there is limited interaction between teachers and headmasters. Communications from teachers to headmaster move through established channels to department heads, deputy headmaster, and headmaster. This system provides a buffer for communications between teachers and principal. In these schools the principals respond to teachers' communications at a time and a place of their own choosing.

---

[5] Peter C. Dodd, Role Conflicts of School Principals. Final Report No. 4, Cooperative Research Project No. 853, October, 1965, p. 3-14.

[6] Ibid., p. 3-13.

The influence of teachers on the principal is in part a function of the informal subgrouping of teachers, the degree of consensus among such groups, and their power as role senders. While teacher subgroup types and constituencies vary from school to school, it is possible to generalize about three typical ones. First are male teachers who have other community affiliations which condition their stance on educational matters and affect their role sending power. For example, vocational agricultural teachers in rural communities may assume positions similar to those held by farmers, express these as sent roles to their principals, and exert significant influences on them. Male teachers are also sometimes identified with vocations other than that of teaching. Their influence depends upon the prestige which their reference role commands. If it has higher prestige than that of teaching, they are said to have "surplus" prestige in their teaching role.

The second category consists of female teachers with deep community roots whose primary role is that of teacher. The influence of these persons is in relation to the prestige which they hold from their other community associations. All else being equal, females have less prestige and thus less influence on the principal's role definition than men.

Some female teachers bring surplus prestige to their teaching role. One example is the local medical doctor's wife who holds a teaching position. Since her wife's role is dominant over her vocational role, she gains her social prestige from the role of her husband. This is reflected in the influence which she can exert in the school. On the other hand, a woman can suffer a loss of prestige as a result of the occupational role of her husband. Some highly competent females overcome such a deficiency prestige by becoming "professionals" and declaring their independence from their marital role.

A third category is made up of both male and female teachers who have few roots in the community. These may be new teachers or teachers who have not developed broad and influential contacts outside the school. They generally have limited power in the principal's role definition. This is not to infer that teachers with little power do not influence the principal through rational persuasion.

One cannot assume that teachers within each of the three above categories will work together or reflect consensus in influencing the principal's role. Teacher informal associations may be based on common interests or on approximate age. The unique pattern of these groupings will be reflected in the sent roles to the principal.

The principal can make use of teacher consensus or non-consensus regardless of whether he concurs. Consensus presents a reason for compliancy without assuming full responsibility. He can use non-consensus as reason for non-action or he can initiate action of his own desire in a situation made neutral by competing forces.

Until recently teachers in the United States had very limited ways to exert concerted pressure on the administrator. Teachers' unions have traditionally been weak, leaving them with little recourse concerning the principal's behavior.

The recent strengthening of the teacher's position through the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association is placing them in a stronger bargaining position to bring influence on the school and thus on the principal's role.

Strong teachers' unions have longer histories in all other countries studied. Headmasters frequently revealed their deep concern over the possibility of being sanctioned by the Post Primary Teachers' Union -- even though they themselves hold membership in the union.

As the result of unionization in the United States, the principal's role has been altered. Many secondary schools now have building policy committees, newly developed communication channels for grievances, and limitations on teachers' duties. One clear example is in the State of Michigan where the "rights and obligations" of the principal to supervise instruction in the classroom have been sharply limited through negotiation.

A critical issue for principals in the United States is determining exactly where they belong in the newly emerging union-management polarized system. Principals in New Zealand and Australia consider themselves first teachers and second administrators, and therefore identify closely with teachers. In the United States, the pattern is not yet crystalized. The role of the principal is quite different when defined as an arm of management rather than as a member of the teachers' union.

When a group organizes itself along peer lines, its influences are expressed through agreed upon and often crystalized positions. Therefore, with increased teacher-organized influences, there is and will be an increasing crystalization in classroom content, procedures, processes, and relationships among teachers. All other things being equal, classroom innovative practices will vary inversely with the degree of influence from externally controlled teacher organizations.

The history of unionization suggests that as teacher demands can no longer be met on the building or district level, unions will agree upon larger groupings and negotiate at the state and eventually the national level. As these agreements are made at higher levels, the principal's role will continue to be redefined -- his influence on teachers will be decreased. Also, potential school innovations which are in conflict with teacher union positions will have less chance of success.

One must examine the role sets of various teacher subgroups to understand the teacher's expectations of the principal and the degree of freedom the principal is permitted to exercise in role definition. The principal has greater lattitude if the school consists of a number of informal subgroups than if a strong externally supported teachers' organization functions. In the past principals have frequently instigated innovations because no one subgroup was adequately powerful to question the action. Teachers' organizations by their nature have very strong ties with powers outside the school systems.

Students

Dodd states that "the social status of the student is relatively low and the expectations they hold for the principal may have relatively little importance to the latter. The students are not crucial as definers. . ."[7] Dodd continues by stating that the principal is guided in his actions toward students through an adult defined "student welfare" value.

His analysis of the students' impact on the principal's behavior is oversimplified. He is right in that there are cultural norms, organizational norms and third parties which condition all social contracts. Of course, norms and third parties will be more restrictive on social contracts between adults and students than between adults and adults.

It is quite well established through the work of Smith[8] that in American society there is a youth culture which behaves as a minority group. The norms of this group are highly precise. They exist both within and without the school and strong sanctions operate to control group membership. They have developed techniques both for protecting their own value structure from adult intrusion and for influencing the adult culture.

The American system places the locus of responsibility for student success on the school -- not on the student. Since there are strong cultural pressures to keep youth in school, the principal cannot eliminate those who are unwilling to interrelate with adults on adult terms. Also, well delineated youth-determined behavioral norms operate and the parental group has either capitulated to the youth position through the influence of their own children or has given tacit support to teenage values. This commits the principal to be sensitive to youth demands far beyond the "welfare" level.

Students then exert their influence through a powerful third party -- the parents. The American principal is sensitive to what parents believe, and according to Dodd, "parents may be in a position to apply strong pressure to the principal."[9] An example of this can be found in the case study of

---

[7] Ibid., p. 3-12.

[8] Ernest Smith, American Youth Culture (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962).

[9] Dodd, op. cit., p. 3-13.

"The Senior Trip" in which persistent student pressure on parents reversed the position of the board of education concerning a school issue.[10]

Also, we should not overlook the influence that students from high social status families play on the administrator's role. The principal may find himself making program decisions to accommodate relatively few of the students, not because the decision is best for all, but as a result of the pressure of a student subgroup.

We must take into account also the power of students through their relationships with locally employed teachers. Frequently these teachers reflect student-influenced parental values. This is an important factor in the American system in which a significant percentage of teachers may be first of all local citizens and secondly teachers in the community schools.

The influence of parents in school matters is not founded entirely upon their role as "parent". The third party practices of effectively monitoring and interceding with the principal's behavior may be based upon the father's professional and community roles. School personnel in the United States are sensitive about the power of parents and tend to behave accordingly. Parents acting for their children seldom act in their parents' role alone but rather in other social prestige roles. This may also explain why persons with high social prestige are more prone to intercede for their children than parents with low social prestige.

Dodd may have meant that students do not use the same process that other groups do in influencing the principal. This may have been the case a few years ago. This investigation, however, revealed that United States principals have now made definite changes in their relationships with students as a result of recent student militancy and demands. Students are effective in making the principal redefine his role. They are included on more committees; they have more power in school decisions; they are provided with more opportunities to confront the principal about grievances; they have stimulated the creation of open forums where they can question the principal and teachers; and they have thus brought about a more open interaction between themselves and the principal. There is evidence all over the world that students are beginning to raise their voices. They may, through organized confrontation, exert even greater pressure on the secondary principal in the near future.

In other countries studied, students appear to exert very little direct or indirect influence on the principal. In these more centralized systems, effective parent pressure must be exerted at the state level. Cultural norms do not support parental interference in the way the school manages pupil personnel. In general, students are required to conform to the school rules without protest. In such schools, there are few signs of youth group patterns or group norms. Although the question of youth subgroups was not explored in depth, it appeared that such youth minority groups had not found their way into the school system.

---

[10] Jack Culbertson, Paul Jacobson, and Theodore Reller, Administrative Relationships: A Casebook (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960) p. 123-142.

Parents

Parents in the United States are in a position to bring strong pressure to bear on the principal. The sources of this influence are first, American norms which openly or tacitly support a parent's right to influence the school on behalf of children; second, an organizational structure which places crucial decisions -- particularly those concerning school personnel -- in the control of locally elected officials; and third, a practice of employing professional personnel from the local community.

Deep-seated in the American culture is the right of parents to maintain significant control over the education of their children. This attitude is reflected in many national, state, and local issues, i.e., the teaching of evolution and sex in the schools, consolidation of schools, accreditation of schools, the right of local agencies to employ and dismiss professional personnel, etc.

Basic American philosophy generally supports the parents' role in decisions relevant to new movements in education. The recent parental protest against transporting students from neighborhood schools to schools located elsewhere is based, in part, on a defense against the loss of parental control over the education of their children.

Parental positions concerning the role of the principal and the function of the school are often communicated through long-standing community-rooted school personnel. It is a common practice in the United States to employ as teachers wives of prominent local professional and business men. Since these teachers frequently occupy community roles with higher social prestige than that of other teachers or even the principal, they are in a position to exert greater pressure on the principal than other professional personnel.

In our American system, school personnel are employed and dismissed by board members. Members are elected by parents and are therefore sensitive to their desires about the school. Many principals in the United States may succeed or fail on the basis of how parents evaluate them and the way they fulfill their roles. While administrators argue that board members should encourage parents to go to school officials with their concerns, many parents feel more comfortable approaching board members.

A very obvious difference between the American school system and the others studied is in the role that parents play in school issues. Headmasters in other countries studied are not deeply concerned about parental expectations of their roles or the general function of the educational systems. Parents seldom confront the principals except when motivated by great anger. The general norm concerning the role of the parents does not support parental interference. Principals do experience strain from parental dissatisfaction but it is not because the parent can do them any harm. The strain results from being obliged to listen to vigorous protests. They listen because the parent "needs to get it out of his system." These principals are not usually concerned about the legitimate reason for criticism but rather about the personal discomfort of the parent confrontation.

Secondary schools studied in New Zealand, Australia, and England usually have a school board of local governors with certain noninstructional responsibilities. These groups, which may be characterized as parental support groups, often raise funds for certain school facilities. The principal, of course, realizes certain professional advantages from the success of adding facilities beyond those furnished by the state. The parents, then, in these instances do assist the principal with his purposes but there is no organizational procedure through which parents can "hurt" the headmaster.

The Principal's Family

While this study does not indicate that principals share details of their jobs with their wives, the family does influence their professional roles in two ways. First, the family competes for his time and energy; and second, the family serves a role allocation function for its members.

Conflict eminating from the simultaneous occupancy of two or more roles is frequently a source of stress and strain. Frequently, the family role is in greater competition with the occupational role for the time and energy of the male. While limitations on interview time prevented a comprehensive study of the school-family role relationships, this did not appear to create a serious conflict. More study is needed in this area.

The home also serves what Goode calls a role allocation function. He says,

> "For adult or child the family is the main center of role allocation and this assumes a key position in solutions of role strain. Most individuals must account to their families for what they spend in time, energy, and money outside of the family. . . . Consequently family relations form the most immediate and persistent set of interactions which are of importance in social control. . . . (The family) also becomes a vantage point from which to view one's total role system in perspective because it is a set of status obligations which change little from day to day and from which escape is difficult. Role alternatives can be evaluated against a fairly stable background. Consequently, other family members can and do give advice as to how to allocate energies from a secure center. Thus it is from this center that one learns the basic procedures of balancing role strains. . . . The intense sentiments within the family cushion individual strain by inducing each person to make concessions to give sympathy to the others. Of course, greater strain is experienced when they do not. These status

rights and obligations then become role retreats or role escapes with demands which are felt to be less stringent."[11]

The principal's wife may help him make decisions concerning the time and priority allocations given to his work or time and priorities given to recreating to protect his health or resolve conflict. The wife is important in role definition regardless of which "wife's role" she serves.

Other Members of the Role Set

Teachers, students, parents, and superordinates have been routinely included in this investigation as members of the principal's role set. The limitation of this procedure is that one or more of the groups may have very little influence on the definition of the principal's role and others not discussed above may exert a great deal of influence. Furthermore, the unique pattern of role sets may vary considerably from school to school, region to region, and country to country. It cannot always be assumed that the four above groups exert the major influence.

To develop an accurate analysis, additional members of the principal's role set must be identified. The process used by Kahn to identify role sets is to ask the focal person such questions as: "Who is your immediate supervisor? Is there anyone else you report to? Who reports directly to you? Who else must you be concerned about in your work because of the relationship of your jobs? Who is important to you personally -- with whom you might discuss your work? Is there anyone else who might have real interest in your job?" Kahn arbitrarily limited the number of members of the role set which were considered to be the most influential in the focal person's role definition.

There is a wide range of positions which can be included in the role set. Other role senders named by principals during interviews were: wife or other family members, business and professional men in the community, persons in similar roles in other school systems, and university professors. Also named were both specific teachers and specific parents who exert greater influence than that normally experienced. There were some cases in which students close to the principal influenced his role definition in reference to all students. The role analytical model, then, must include major role senders regardless of whether they fit within predetermined categories.

Cultural, Societal, Historical, and Organizational Factors

This section of the report will discuss selected cultural, societal, historical and organizational factors relevant to the secondary school principal's role definition. No effort is made to designate whether these are cultural or organizational norms. At this point, they are included as general factors which influence the definition of the principal's role and must be accounted for in a systematic theory of behavior.

---

[11] W. J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, 25, 1960, p. 493. See Appendix D.

Education -- a privilege or right. Studies in countries outside of the United States clearly illustrate the cultural and school relationships. For example, Ray McCulloch at Monash University in Victoria, postulates that the external examination system is moved to higher grade levels to control the available labor force in the states of Australia. Funds are made available for education in accordance with the technical skills required by the larger culture. If the need is for an increased number of unskilled laborers, the examination system is kept at lower age levels. If the need is for skilled labor, examinations are given at an older age.

Since work roles for the uneducated are plentiful in cultures not highly developed technologically, education tends to be a privilege rather than a right. In America's highly developed technological culture schools are expected to educate all students since there are relatively few positions for the uneducated. In the United States a predominant educational value is that all students have the "right" to an education.

Economic philosophy and education. Socialistic countries such as New Zealand tend to reflect a "uniformity" in many areas of their educational organizations such as student uniforms, set curricula, and uniform salary schedules. Education for consumption, in the words of Jules Henry[12] shapes America's populace to wear out and to waste. Materialistic values of our culture are reflected in the purposes and performances of the schools and in the role of the secondary principal.

Religion and education. In most schools studied outside of the United States, school religious exercises are required or permitted. Scotland has a Protestant and Catholic dual system while Free Ireland has a multiplicity of religious schools.

Principals of religious state-supported schools are often responsible to a board of governors including church representatives. Frequently the greatest pressure such principals experience is not concerning what happens in the total educational program, but rather in connection with religious education activities. They may be first a minister or priest and second a principal. They may have received their entire education in schools of their religious faith which significantly influences the definition of their role.

Tradition and education. As the British extended their empire, the Scottish people introduced their system of education into these occupied areas. As a result, the traditional Scottish educational system continues to operate in many countries once occupied by the British.

---

[12] Jules Henry, Man Against Culture (West Minister, Maryland: Random House, 1963).

While traditional patterns may influence the definition of the American principal's role, it is not to the same extent as in other English-speaking countries. The American tradition is more likely to be one of change and rejection of past patterns and practices than that of crystalization of past patterns.

Urbanization and education. The world urbanization movement has had a profound impact upon the pattern of living. The explosion and implosion of population has brought with it many differing value patterns, diversity of peoples and institutions, and mixtures of racial groups. The school system is caught in this variability. It must accommodate a greater variety of pupils and provide for versatility. The principal finds it necessary to become more flexible due to the variability of the student body. This impact of urbanization upon the school and upon the principal's role is much greater in the United States than in urban centers abroad. While a large percent of Australians do live in large urbanized centers, these cities consist of a large number of relatively autonomous subcommunities. Therefore, they do not experience the same urban school problems as does the United States.

Student grouping. The ways used to group students for secondary education have numerous implications for both the school and the principal. Furthermore, methods of school grouping have contributed to a critical secondary school crisis -- especially in the United States.

In foreign countries studied, students through an application system enter one of three types of secondary schools -- grammar, technical or comprehensive. Each type of school is attributed relative cultural prestige. Furthermore, schools within each of the three types hold various informal prestige rankings. The results are: first, the type and prestige of these schools influence the roles of their headmasters; and second, students from each neighborhood are dispersed throughout a number of secondary schools in the locality. Those students who can be admitted will attend the grammar school with technical and comprehensive following in order. Families in England, New Zealand, Australia, Ireland, and Scotland seldom move from one location to another for the purpose of having their children attend a particular school. Consequently, communities in these countries tend to be socio-economically heterogeneous.

American youth are grouped through a self-selection process resulting in divisions roughly following socio-economic lines. This comes about through certain zoning regulations which results in communities of people within similar income brackets.

A division of youth by social class has two important implications for the American principal. First, the homogeneous nature of students in a particular school will in part shape the principal's role and second, the concentrations of socio-economic subgroups has tended to accentuate and reinforce certain subgroup problems. These subgroup problems have brought tremendous pressures on principals in all the United States but particularly on those in lower socio-economic schools in urban centers. So different are the roles of incumbents of the two extremes that different selection and preparation programs are often advocated.

Educational organization and role. In New Zealand and Australia, educational units are very large; they have centralized decision-making functions; they are administered by a professional educator; and they are fully state financially supported. In England, educational units are organized on a county basis, are administered by a nonprofessional administrator, practice a decentralized system of educational decision-making, are financed both through state funds allocated to local authorities and through unit funds, and they have virtually no centralized evaluation plan.

It is obvious that the roles of principals are quite different in these systems. There is a much higher level of uniformity of operation in the schools of New Zealand and Australia than in England. English schools experience more innovations through their local school leadership while in New Zealand and Australia innovations are introduced from the top. In the English system, the principal depends on persons and groups outside the local authority for educational advice and guidance while in New Zealand and Australia, principals rely more on the central authority. In New Zealand and Australia, the range of acceptable principalship behavior is narrower and incidents of deviate behavior are fewer. In England where the model for principalship behavior is not so precise, deviations from accepted expectations are much greater.

The English and United States educational organizations are much more similar to one another than they are to New Zealand, Australia, Ireland, and Scotland. Both the United States and England can learn much from each other concerning the organization and operation of basic educational units.

Internal characteristics and role. The number, type, selection, and evaluation of students are internal factors which have significant import upon what the principal does and how he does it. In large schools, the principal must relate to the student body and organize for subgroup interaction in much different ways than in smaller schools. This is done through administrative assistants, representative student groups, and various modifications of schools within schools. The method of school within a school, or "houses" within the school, is practiced in certain large schools in both the United States and England.

The prefect system is common in countries studied outside the United States. A select group of upper-form students are elected or selected to serve as monitors and disciplinarians in the school. Prefects are extended certain privileges and opportunities to become personally acquainted with the administrative staff. The principal relies heavily upon them and especially upon their elected boy and girl heads for interpretation of student interest and attitudes.

The type of student with whom the principal works helps shape his role. A principal's relative prestige outside the school may depend largely upon the prestige of his student body. In countries where students enter one of three school systems on the basis of examination scores, principals in the school requiring the highest performance -- the grammar school -- possess prestige and power not enjoyed by the other principals. The principal of a grammar school rarely encounters disciplinary problems or militant student behavior. Students in high prestige schools consider it a special privilege to be included and they take few chances of being expelled. Parents strongly support behavior expected by the school and students meet the demands of the school without protest.

Students in low prestige schools have much less to lose by protest and rebellion. The principal's role in such schools is greatly influenced both by the degree of submission of the students and by his own power to manage solutions for his difficulties. Principals of lower prestige comprehensive schools expressed concern over the fact that the higher prestige schools -- even though seriously questioned by leading advocates of government policy -- appear to be favored in the educational organization.

The examination and evaluation system conditions the principal's role. Schools with external examinations have little lattitude to shape the direction and scope of their curricula. The risks are too high to introduce innovative curricular practices. The more demanding the external examinations, the greater will be the principal's stress on preparation for examinations.

In the United States college preparation continues to be a factor in shaping the role of the school. Principals experience less strain by emphasizing college preparation programs. They depend on greater relative support from parents of college bound students and from university officials than from parents of noncollege students.

The relationship patterns between the secondary school principal and teachers in New Zealand, Australia, Scotland and to a lesser degree England are much more firmly established than in the United States. Principals in these countries depend more on department heads through which teacher problems are expected to be channeled. This limits his span of direct control and he then works closely with deputies and department heads.

Since teachers have unlimited tenure after their initial probation period in foreign countries studied, principals cannot dismiss teachers and generally have very limited influence in getting teachers transferred. Seldom is the principal directly responsible for evaluating the teacher's effectiveness even though he may participate with inspectors in a formal teacher inspection. In these countries, he cannot be held accountable for ineffective teaching since he has little control over the teaching process.

In the United States, one of the sources of stress is that of teacher evaluation and possible recommendations for dismissal. Principals expressed concern about this responsibility.

Norms. Role theorists use "norms" to define agreements about appropriate or inappropriate behavior for all persons in a social system. Social system can refer to a very large interdependent group such as a nation or to smaller units such as a school or family. Just as personality consists of the common elements of all a person's historical and current roles, norms are the common elements of the historical and current role behavior of an interdependent group.

Some norms persist even though the reasons for their creation no longer exist. Conversely, new norms based on emerging conditions are slow to develop. Cultures may permit their members to deviate from some norms but not from others. Sanctions may vary for non-compliance on various norms. Goode cites certain problems with the concept of "the normative, consensual commitment of the individuals to the society." He believes that individuals vary greatly in commitment, emotional support, conflicting values, etc. The norm concept as now defined is not adequately delineated to serve as a precise dimension of the theory.[13]

There is no simple method for identifying and analyzing cultural norms. We will need to rely on comprehensive anthropological studies to clearly understand the larger norm structures. In cases where such studies are missing or are not readily applicable to school systems, the best information possible can be included as a necessary variable. While objective analytical instruments are helpful, they usually consider only one of many cultural norm elements. Cultural anthropologists generally hold the position that in collecting cultural norm data, carefully structured interviews and observations are far superior to objective instruments.

Organizational norms. Organizational norms are behavioral expectations of all members of an organization while role are expectations for a particular "division of labor" position within the organization. A principal, then, reflects in his behavior the expectations held for him as a member of the culture, as a member of a school staff, and as a principal in the school. Within the organization, there are expectations concerning hair length, the portion of the face which should be shaven, the length of female teachers' dresses, arrival and departure time, attendance at school functions, drinking or smoking, general behavior toward the school audience, and behavioral patterns within the community. In some secondary schools visited, men teachers wear academic gowns throughout the day and all teachers wear academic gowns during assemblies. Organizational norms are applicable to the principal as a member of his organization.

This does not imply that there is consensus about norms appropriate for the school system. There are divergent views with many deviations. Also, not all members of the school system have equal influence in organizational norm establishment and maintenance. The principal may be a powerful force in setting up organizational norms, or a teacher subgroup may influence general conformity. Persons or groups outside the school organization, such as the church, may also be powerful norm setters in the school organization.

An examination of norms in school organizations outside of the United States helps us better understand the functions of norms within our own school systems. For example, the tea break for teachers in New Zealand is a much stronger norm than our American coffee break. The coffee break in American schools might be eliminated, but it would defy both cultural and organizational norms for a headmaster to eliminate tea breaks in New Zealand. Another example: it is not uncommon for teachers and administrators to be released from their positions in the United States. In most other English-speaking countries, there are no legal provisions for releasing professional school personnel. Continuing tenure is an organizational norm in these countries while the releasing of principals and teachers is an organizational norm in the United States.

---

[13] Goode, op. cit., p. 484.

Third parties. General cultural and organizational norms set limits for social contracts possible between and among persons. If one person takes undue advantage of another, if the relationship is considered improper or unfair to either party, sanctions will be brought to bear on one or both parties. Sanctions may be applied directly or indirectly through a focal person's role set. For example, a principal in the United States may permit and prefer students to address him by his first name. Teachers and parents, however, may feel this is improper and bring sanctions to bear on both parties, even though the practice is accepted by both principals and students. Third party sanctions are common in cases where a male principal shows special attention to a female teacher. A principal by virtue of his role is expected by others to claim his rights as a principal -- i.e., bigger desk, carpet, etc., -- and to fulfill his obligations -- i.e., serve as a buffer between teachers and parents, handle student discipline, etc. He will be sanctioned by third parties if he fails to behave in his role as others believe he should.

The third party concept, while difficult to include as an analytical variable, does help explain the general milieu in which the principal negotiates social contracts with members of his role set.[14]

Role Strain

Goode in his theory of role strain declared that role incumbents will seek to reduce role strain through control of the role relationships and by endeavoring to establish interpersonal social contracts which are the least stressful for the principal.[15]

Data collected support Goode's contentions. First, in reference to internal organization, principals continue to follow new or old patterns of "barriers" against intrusion. They maintain a "formality" which discourages intrusion; limit the span of control; assume an "I am busy" attitude; and arrange appointments through secretaries. Headmasters in the other countries studied manage internal relationships by working through department heads and through the "head boy" and "head girl" prefects; by maintaining a formal relationship with teachers and students; by following certain protocol such as the wearing of academic robes; by addressing teachers formally; and by the use of secretaries to protect them from indiscriminate intrusion. Some principals in the United States attempt to demonstrate that they do not resist any efforts by students, teachers, or parents to approach them directly with their concerns. This "open door" policy has emerged as an important cultural and organizational norm. Therefore, behavior which appears to contradict that of reducing stressful informal contact is actually responding to a strong cultural norm. A generalized self-expectation of administrators to be available to everyone creates strong conflicts, for to follow a complete open door policy limits the principal's control of his time and energy.

---

[14] This translation of cultural and organizational norms and third parties is based upon current role analytical concepts. In Chapter IV, the investigator introduces Institutional Role Sets which is believed to clarify vaguely defined third parties.

[15] Goode, op. cit.

A second argument indicating that the administrator manages his role strain through control of interpersonal bargains is that the principal's relationships external to the school are those which are required, which are supportive, which are public relations centered, or recreational. It is necessary that the principal maintain some level of contact with his superordinate. The closeness of this relationship may depend on the degree to which the superordinate will accept the principal as he is and refrain from challenging the role definition as viewed by him. Many directors of education abroad and superintendents of schools in the United States argue for a policy of non-interference with the secondary school principal's role. Stress associated with the relationship depends largely upon the extent to which the superordinate agrees with the principal and/or to what extent he chooses to be an active role sender.

Principals often relate to their counterparts in other schools for support and counsel -- probably more support than counsel. Most say they consult other principals to check their ideas but deny that they ask for advice. In this respect, principals say they make their own decisions in light of their own school system. The seeking of such professional support appears to be limited to other principals, to an occasional specialist in the director or superintendent's office, or to an administrative assistant. The principal seldom seeks professional advice and support from college professors, state department of education members, non-educators, or his wife.

Principals often participate in one or more groups for "public relations" purposes. These relationships may be defined as preventive or remedial actions to control or modify possible attacks against the school or to prepare for some future request. This method may reduce present strain or prevent possible future strain. If the principal participates in a community group which can become critical or powerful enough to counter other critics, he may control or modify potential conflict and thus lessen stress and strain. Rather than to attack, those in a group will come to the rescue of their own members. The principal may become a powerful member of such a group.

Participation in public relations activities reduces the principal's strain in a second way. Not only will the members of his community group protect him, but he will become sensitive about their desires and will reflect these in his administration. Neither "public relations" model stimulates basic innovations in the system.

Secondary school principals in the United States as well as in other countries studied identify closely with teachers. Most have been teachers, continue to identify with teachers, and remember the sting of teacher sanctions. They continue to be highly sensitive about how they are perceived by teachers. It follows that the greatest strain arises from demands which may damage relationships with teachers. Their greatest problems are those of teacher evaluation, teacher regulations, or situations where conflict between students and/or parents and teachers arise. Principals experience stress in situations where other authorities pre-empt their role with students, when central office authorities instruct teachers in their school or when teachers go around them to get what they want.

The principal in the United States is particularly concerned with his new relationship with teachers under professional negotiations. In part, this concern arises from the fear that the teachers may develop such strong allegiance to an outside organization that he will no longer be able to rely on them to support his role definition. He may be forced to renegotiate a new set of social contracts.

Goode's theory of role strain postulates a constant effort on the part of ego to reduce strain by managing an environment approaching equilibrium.

The secondary principal engages in various types of non-school activities. These vary from church, bridge clubs, golf, travel and crafts, to dog raising, etc. They usually make it clear that these recreational groups are largely made up of noneducators and that discussion of school matters is taboo. Such groups are not professionally stressful to the principal.

Whenever possible the principal discontinues rather than promotes external relationships which are stressful. The longer he is in the position, the greater is his stability and the greater is his power to manage the groups with whom he relates. He then limits his external relationships to those with whom he must relate professionally, those who support his position, those who can help him maintain the system, and to groups who meet for other than educational reasons.

A third argument supporting the theory that the principal manages his role strain through the contacts of interpersonal bargains, relates to the major priority which he extends to the teachers in the system. A strategy for managing role strain not developed by Goode's theory but an integral part of the model is that of identifying strongly with one role set and using one's resources to neutralize conflicting wishes of other role set members. If one can either align himself with the basic position of one role set and give his support to their position or if he refrains from openly challenging their position, they in turn will protect him in his position. This is a common type of bargaining. He, then, is in a position to reduce role strain by partially disengaging himself from role senders or potential role senders who would likely create strain. The principal manipulates his environment with the intent of approaching a homostatic condition. He shapes his behavior relative to the various pressures upon him.

If one of his role set members gains influence and power, this condition presents strains and requires that he readjust his interpersonal bargains not only with the role senders in question but all other role senders.

Since teachers have developed greater bargaining power in the United States in recent years, the principal has responded by creating or causing to be created new channels for teacher grievances to be heard, has increased teacher voice in school regulations and has accepted certain guidelines for the principal's behavior in relation to teachers. In other English-speaking countries, principals expressed an awareness of the teacher's potential power by indicating the hope that teachers would not see fit to bring sanctions against them. The growing influence of teachers has required the principal to modify his role to reduce strain.

The growing militancy of students has also created new strains for principals. Many have invested or adopted new relationship devices with students as a result of student demands. Techniques introduced are: to include students on more school committees, to set up open forums in which students can question the principal about their concerns, to extend students the same civil rights privileges as provided for adults, and to extend greater decision making rights for both individuals and groups of students. The principal has often found himself encountering new conflicts and thus new strains as he has attempted to accommodate student demands.

Another frequent source of strain is the ambiguity of the role of central office staff with teachers. Few school districts have clearly defined the roles of central staff supervisors in the secondary school. What the principal considers as infringements on the autonomy of his school is often a source of strain.

The felt strain of the principal comes in part from the level of generalized strain in the culture. A portion of the strain experienced by the principal is "caught" from the larger culture. In New Zealand where the general tenor of living is much slower and more relaxed, a professional man will not necessarily experience a high level of strain.

The "high heat" of the American culture has institutionalized the symptoms of role strain to the extent that they may be associated with positive values such as success, decision making, getting things done, etc. A degree of strain symptoms may be considered a desirable quality in the American way of life. The absence of symptoms of role strain may be viewed as a sign that one is not fulfilling his role. Since we are expected to be under strain, we see to it that we find reason to be.

CHAPTER IV -- ROLE THEORY

HYPOTHESES, THEORY EXTENSION AND PREPARATION APPLICATIONS RELATIVE TO SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The previous chapter describes patterns of secondary school administration across cultural lines within the framework of role and translates these concepts into the language of the theory. Also, illustrative materials from the study are used for both explanatory and supportive purposes.

Chapter IV includes three sections. First is an overlapping system of hypotheses about the principal's role. In the main, these are interlocking, interdependent aspects of the principal's role which are considered basic elements of the framework. Some hypotheses may appear to be simple and obvious but are believed to add meaning when viewed as a part of the total framework. While it is believed that the most pertinent hypotheses are included, it is possible that important ones have been deleted. Also, the analysis is not yet to the stage where relative importance of the variables can be determined. This, of course, must be accomplished if the theory is to be most meaningful.

Second, a theory modification and extension termed "Institutional Role Set" is proposed for the purpose of more accurately explaining the principal's role. This extension is believed to be highly relevant to the principalship as well as generally applicable in the theory's use.

Third, in light of the role analytical system as outlined and modified, concepts of innovation, selection, preparation, and continuing education are integrated to form an action model.

Part 1

HYPOTHESES

The role of the principal is defined by a number of persons, groups, organizational arrangements, historical backgrounds, and cultural norms and attitudes. At this point, it is possible to identify only a number of these factors. Supporting evidence for each is discussed in Chapter III and therefore will not be repeated in this chapter. The specific and relative influence of each must be determined through more precise measuring devices.

Major Hypothesis: The definition of the secondary school principal's role is a function of his role set's expectations, cultural and organizational norms, and the incumbent's role perception. What the principal does in his division of labor position is determined by what he and others around him expect of him. His personal history, the personal histories of his role set, and the tradition of the institution will influence the definition of his role. See Chapter III, pages 20-22.

I. The members of the secondary school principal's role set and their relative influence will be similar yet will vary from school to school and from culture to culture. It is likely that there are similar role set memberships from position to position. The same basic role set has been included in this investigation as was used by Dodd[1] in his national principalship study -- superordinate, students, parents, and teachers. A specific role set must be determined for each principal rather than to assume a fixed membership. The relative influence of any one group will vary considerably from place to place and time to time. See Chapter III, pages 22-23.

I-A. The secondary school principal's superordinate influences the definition of his role. At least three complex relationship variables determine the relative influence which the superordinate has over the principal.

I-A-1. First, the content of the superordinate's role determines the extent to which the superordinate defines the principal's role. The superordinate's role comes from the rights and obligations of his position emerging from complex interaction among his role set, including his personal perception of his own role. The resulting perception of the appropriate relationship with the principal will condition the influence he exerts on the role of the principal.

I-A-2. Second, the distance between the offices of the superordinate and the principal influences the superordinate's role definition of the principal. Distance has both a geographical and psychological dimension. There is a tendency for an inverse relationship between the geographical distance from the school to the superordinate's office and the influence which he exerts on the principal.

I-A-3. Third, the relative power of the superordinate and the secondary principal influences the superordinate's definition of the principal's role. Such factors as the relative time each has served in his respective roles, their associations in the community, other roles they occupy in the community, and the nature of the personal history of each in the community all influence the relative power of each incumbent. See Chapter III, pages 23-25.

I-B. The secondary school principal's role definition is influenced by the teachers in the school where he functions. All principals and headmasters were asked, "What individual or group of individuals are you most sensitive about displeasing in your role as principal?" The answer was consistently, "the teachers". In general they are highly sensitive to the expectations which teachers have for them and to the teachers' evaluation of their role behavior. See Chapter III, pages 25-28.

---

[1] Peter C. Dodd, "Role Conflicts of School Principals", Graduate School of Education, Harvard University. N. 853 (SAE-8702) Cooperative Research Branch, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I-B-1. The degree, direction, and pattern of teacher influence upon the secondary school principal's role depends upon the nature of teacher subgroups and the positions held by them. Teachers hold a range of views about the principal's role. The range of their sent roles may be as great as from the principal's total role set. Teacher influence on the principal depends upon the pattern of teacher subgroups; the degree of consensus among them; influences which come through them from outside individuals and groups; and the prestige held by these external groups. See Chapter III, pages 25-28.

I-B-2. The secondary school principal's role is in part defined through inter-system and intra-system teachers' unions. The present unionization of teachers in the United States is changing the role of the principal -- at times dramatically. Professional negotiations redefine the teachers' role automatically changing their relationship with the principal. See Chapter III, pages 25-28.

I-C. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by the students in the school. Role theorists generally include students as a member of the principal's role set. Student influence varies considerably between the United States where they are successfully making demands on the principal and other countries where students have minimal impact upon the principal's role definition. See Chapter III, pages 28-30.

I-C-1. The principal's role definition is influenced by students through third parties. While third parties act as referees for all levels of social contracts, the scrutiny of behavior where youth is concerned is much more intense. Students have been effective in influencing the principal's role through their parents. See Chapter III, pages 28-30.

I-D. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by parents of students in the school. The parents' influence varies considerably between schools within a culture and between schools across cultural lines. Principals in the United States have some lattitude concerning the inclusion of parental influence on the school. Parents are expected to have the right to protest. In other countries studied parents expect to assist the school on projects but have limited influence on the headmaster directly. See Chapter III, pages 30-31.

I-E. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by the unique pattern of his family role. While his wife and family may not participate directly in the specifics of his professional role, they generally influence his school role in two ways. First, the family may be competing for his time and energy; and second, the family frequently serves a role allocation function for its members. See Chapter III, pages 31-32.

II. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by certain cultural, societal, historical and organizational factors. The secondary school's purpose, process and style of operation are conditioned by a number of cultural and organizational factors. These factors also influence the principal's role. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-A. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by the arrangements through which religious groups express themselves in the state's school systems. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-B. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by the values and practices associated with the economic and governmental systems practiced by the state. See Chapter III, page 33.

II-C. The secondary school principal's role is influenced by the tradition of the larger culture and of the total educational system. School systems are rooted in certain basic assumptions and patterns of operations. Even though they may change, they maintain certain historical characteristics. The principal's role is conditioned by the historical character of the total system. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-D. The secondary principal's role is influenced by the degree to which the service area as well as larger state units have urbanized. The explosion and the implosion of population are world-wide phenomona. Urbanization is influencing the nature of the educational system and thus the principal's role. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-E. The role of the secondary school principal is influenced by the prevailing system of determining which students will attend the various types of schools. School systems have developed ways to divide youth for educational purposes. The nature of formal or informal devices for student divisions has an impact on the principal's role. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-F. The role of the secondary school principal is influenced by educational unit factors such as: the political organization, the relationship of education to the larger state, the system for financing education, the size of the unit and the school population, the centralization and decentralization of authority, and the unit-wide unionization of educational personnel. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

II-G. The role of the secondary school principal is influenced by factors internal to the schools such as enrollment, type of students, pattern and system of student evaluation, organization of the school, span of control, staffing, unionization of professional personnel, staff evaluation and relative prestige. See Chapter III, pages 32-38.

III. Hereditary conditioning and environmental orientation prepares the principal to respond to role occupancy both in culturally generalized and individually specialized ways.

III-A. Each principal reflects his uniqueness in how he defines his principalship and his response to the definitions held by members of his role set.

III-B. The principal manipulates his environment to reduce his role strain. Goode presented, and this study supports, the theory that administrative behavior is a function of the processes utilized to prevent, reduce and manage role strain. See Chapter III, pages 38-41.

III-C. The secondary school principal's role strain is intensified when one or more role sets gain and express new powers in reference to his role, when the behavior of one or more of his role sets are modified, or when one or more of the role members of one of his counter roles gains power over or modifies behavior toward their counter roles. See Chapter III, pages 38-41.

III-D. The felt strain of the secondary school principal comes in part from the level of generalized strain of the culture. See Chapter III, pages 38-41.

Part 2

INSTITUTIONAL ROLE SETS

A basic and highly useful concept of role is that a social system consists of a network of interrelated division of labor positions. These positions are relatively stable and are characterized by predetermined "rights and obligations". When one occupies a position, he is expected to behave as previously defined by the social system and will be sanctioned for deviate behavior. As he expresses the "rights and obligations" of the position, he is said to be playing a role. The unique way in which he expresses his role is his role behavior. An organization or institution is an interrelated cluster of these interdependent roles.

Because positions are interlocking and interdependent, any one role depends for its success upon the role behavior of a number of closely related roles. Conversely, these related roles depend upon the behavior of the central role under consideration -- the focal role. The interdependent roles surrounding a focal role are called the role set. The "rights and obligations" of a focal role are a function of the expectations of role set. Unique role behavior is a function of the expectations of the role set plus the definition of the role as perceived by the role incumbent.

Societal institutions may be conceptualized as a network of interrelated division of labor position clusters. Greater efficiency is realized by clustering both similar and diverse roles in a system designed to fulfill a division of labor function. Institutions serve specialized services to other institutions or to the total social system just as individuals do to their role set.

Institutions, just as positions, are relatively stable and are also characterized by predetermined "rights and obligations" within the larger social system. Institutions may also experience informal sanctions from other institutions or may experience formal sanctions through the courts.

An institution may be conceptualized as representing "rights and obligations" irrespective of the persons occupying key institutional roles. In other words, the interrelated cluster of positions called an institution has the same relationship to other interrelated role clusters as one position within a cluster has to other cluster members.

We then can conceptualize the sum of the rights and obligations of a cluster of interrelated roles without occupants as *institutional position*. The sum total of the occupants acting out the "rights and obligations" of this cluster of interrelated positions is *institutional role*. The unique expression of a particular group of institutional position occupants is here termed *institutional role behavior*.

Because institutions as well as individual positions are interlocking and interdependent, any one institution depends upon others for its successful functioning. The institution under consideration is called the *focal institution*. The interdependent institutions surrounding the focal institution make up its *institutional role set*. One can also say that the rights and obligations of a focal institution are a function of its institutional role set. Institutional role behavior is a function of the expectations of its role set plus the interpretation of its rights and obligations by all occupants of all institutional roles.

The concept of focal institutions and institutional role sets, patterned from individual roles and their role sets, is useful in role analysis in many ways.

One obvious and direct use of the concept is its use in analyzing the interrelationships of institutions and the extent to which they function interdependently. The study of institutional breakdown in fulfilling the system's obligations to other societal institutions is possible within this framework. Problems such as inter-institutional communication can be studied in this manner.

A poorly defined aspect of role concerns a vague area of role expectations which eludes analysis of source and specificity. These expectations do not appear to originate with members of the role set but rather to flow from the larger culture or indirectly through role senders. This source is usually termed "cultural norms", "organizational norms", or "third parties". It is reasonable to believe that a great proportion of these poorly defined sent roles emerge from institutional role sets.

Since institutions have not traditionally visualized themselves as one of a number of interlocking institutions, their external communication system has generally focused on the total social system rather than toward specific interdependent institutions. They may depend on generalized means for both transmitting inter-institutional sent roles and for receiving roles from other institutions. The result is the receipt of fragmentary messages from institutional role sets resulting in ambiguity about expectations from other institutions. Conversely, fragmentary expectations are sent to interrelated institutions.

The concept of institutional role sets helps clarify intra-institutional and inter-institutional sent roles. Intra-institutional sent roles are those concerned with internal interdependent division of labor positions. Inter-institutional sent roles are those prescriptions, proscriptions and evaluations which originate from roles in one institution for role incumbents in a second institution.

The institutional role set concept sharpens the meaning of boundary roles. For example, Dodd refers to parents as a boundary role member of the school principal role set. In our model, they are not intra-institutional role members. Parents may be better classified as members of one of the school's institutional role sets -- the family. This concept may clarify the identification of role set members according to inter- and intra-institutional role relationships. It is possible that intra-role sets can be dealt with quite differently tha inter-institutional role sets.

The use of the institutional role set concept should sharpen the theory and thus provide a greater range of research knowledge. Also, it should facilitate innovative attempts in institutions since more information can be made available about possible attitudes of and implications for other institutions. For example, the secondary school is in a much better position to foster change if it maintains two-way communications with its institutional role set as well as clear internal communications.

The institutional role set model conceptualizes an institution as being a role set member to a number of institutions as well as being seen in a focal role. An institution is a role sender as well as role receiver. One can theorize that a minimum of external governmental control would be necessary in a society consisting of a flexible network of interdependent division of labor institutions with open two-way communication channels among them. With better communications, inter-sanctions among them would conceivably operate as they do among individual role incumbents. External governmental controls are required by both individuals and institutions when interpersonal and inter-institutional communication is vague. Individual and institutional flexibility is a function of being open and sensitive to both other individuals and institutions.

Institutional Focal Role -- The Secondary School

The tendency has been to view the secondary school as a subsystem of the total community educational system -- and that it is. However, the secondary school may be considered a separate institution assigned by society a division of labor function -- that of orienting youth to current and future American culture. Within this context, the central office with the board of education, other secondary schools, and elementary schools within the district are viewed as other institutions rather than as subparts of a whole.

It is helpful to view the principalship within two quite different constellations of role senders. First, there are role senders within the institution representing division of labor roles designed to meet the goals of the school. Included are students, teachers, para-professional personnel, and nonprofessional personnel. Second, there are individual role senders representing the purposes and goals of external institutions. This group of role senders includes the official representative of the central authority, other principals, families, employers of students, etc. In the second instance, the principal serves in what Kahn calls a boundary role. In our model, he occupies a specialized division of labor function including that of communicating with the secondary school's institutional role set. A unique characteristic of the principal's role is that he, more than any other personnel in the school, is responsible for this inter-institutional communication.

Within this framework we can no longer depend upon the central administrative authority to translate the larger culture's range of expectations for the secondary school. While the central office is doubtless the most important significant other institution among the secondary school's role set, it is far from the only one. The principal's role definition will be greatly clarified if he consciously views himself within a constellation of institutional role senders including the central office. Within this framework, the principal is not an inactive recipient of the sent roles from or through the central office but rather he becomes the most active role sender concerning secondary education, and serves as leader in drafting policies relevant to secondary school education.

The secondary school principal encounters different levels of conflict, ambiguity, and overload in serving in an inter-institutional context. Traditionally, the problem has been one of inadequate communication. Not only is there a lack of clarity in messages received but also there is vagueness about the source and the power of the source. Establishing direct contact with institutional role senders is considered a first step in managing the conflict arising from ambiguous expectations. If the principal can face directly representatives of institutions which are highly interdependent with the secondary school, he is much better able to understand as well as to modify positions held by these institutional representatives.

One should not assume that the process of identifying and interacting with role sending institutions will necessarily alleviate conflict, ambiguity, overload or its resultant stress. The process may tend to increase stress in its initial stages. However, it is assumed that over the long run, stress and strain may be reduced as the principal enlarges his awareness of and becomes more sensitive to role senders from interrelated institutions. Role strain reduction will result from internal innovations triggered by inconsistencies with the school's institutional role set. Continued administrative behavior which results in increasing inconsistence between the secondary schools and our larger society will inevitably create great stress on the school. There are signs of loss of confidence in the school system resulting from current definitions of secondary education.

The Secondary School's Institutional Role Set

The membership of the secondary school institutional role set can be assumed but not assured without depth investigation. The institutional role set is assumed to include the family, the elementary school, higher education, the central administration office, certain offices of state and government, elements of the business and industrial world, religious organizations, and one which may be termed the teenage subculture. More may be identified with additional study.

An illustration of an institutional role set is that of the family. This insitution has obviously been a powerful influence in defining secondary schools. Pressure is brought to bear directly upon the school as well as indirectly through other members of the school's institutional role set such as the board of education and the central educational agency. Since families are small units, their impact may be expressed through family members who are also associated with other institutions, i.e., an official of a business or a governmental official. Influence of the family can be illustrated by what has happened to some modular scheduled programs. Parental dissatisfaction with the degree of freedom allowed students has stimulated some schools to drastically redesign their original plans.

A second illustration: certain businesses may be identified as an institutional role set of the secondary school system. Representatives of these businesses may express views about the role of the school to the principal, to the central office superintendent, or to the board of education. These spokesmen may be considered as translators of the norms of their organizations relative to what is expected of the school.

Within the institutional role context developed here, there is a question about whether the teenage culture might not be included among the institutions for analysis. If one accepts Smith's[2] position, teenagers as a group do serve a special division of labor function. They have unique norms with a well developed system of sanctions to control their own group. There are within the group structure closely knit systems which are influential and make their wishes known. While they, as an institution, have not yet turned their major influence upon the school, they have served as a powerful force working through their parents. It may be wise strategy on the part of the school to consider the teenage group as an institution and deal with them in the same way as with other institutions external to the school.

Part 3

PREPARATION APPLICATIONS

In the first part of this chapter, a number of propositions stated in a role framework are presented. These propositions deal with persons and groups influential in defining the secondary principal's role, cultural and organizational factors influencing his role, and the sources and reduction of his role stress and strain in the principalship.

The second section of this chapter discusses a modification and extension of role theory -- that of institutional role sets. This theory innovation is believed to provide new ways to view boundary roles such as that of the secondary school principal.

---

[2] Ernest Smith, American Youth Culture (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962).

This third and final chapter section incorporates (1) basic secondary school principalship role related concepts; (2) institutional role sets as outlined in the above section of this chapter; (3) the sources for the purposes of secondary education inherent in the model; (4) provisions and lattitude for innovative practices in the model; and (5) implications for selecting, preparing, and continuing education for secondary principals.

The central purpose of secondary education is to be found in the larger culture of which the secondary school is a part. For example: the reason that education is a "right" in the United States and a "privilege" in many other countries is to be found in the larger structure and organization of society. The sources of educational needs and appropriate directions for educational change are to be found in the secondary school's institutional role set rather than in traditional subject matter. Secondary school roles -- the administrator as well as teachers -- are not adequate translators of educational needs unless they are highly sensitive to the school's institutional role set.

A role definition of the principal consistent with the above stated purpose of secondary education is that of interpreting and translating the content from the school's institutional role set and instigating appropriate changes in the educational processes and programs. The thesis has already been developed that secondary principals tend to identify strongly with internal groups, especially teachers, and to reinforce these internal groups in their interpretation of education. Principals have few, if any, models to help them see their role in basically different ways.

The secondary school principal in interpreting the meaning of the content and directional changes in the school's institutional role set must serve as an innovator or develop the organizational climate in which innovation can take place. Societal institutions including the secondary school are undergoing rapid change. The changes occurring in any one institution become important for all other institutions. Either an institution can wait to be forced to change by others in the society or it can build in processes to be sensitive and current with other institutions in the larger culture. The administrative head of a school can logically be considered to fill the major liaison role between the institution and the institutional role set. The principal is a specialist in interpreting the school's institutional role set to those occupying roles in the organization.

The secondary school is an institutional role set member for other cultural institutions. It is the secondary school principal's responsibility to become an active role sender to these institutions. He must not only gain support from other groups but must interpret to them the content, process, purposes, and problems of the school institution as it relates to the larger culture. The principal should be the most competent person to interpret to other institutions the role that secondary schools are playing in the larger culture.

The secondary school principal must learn and practice techniques for re-educating members of his role set concerning logical redefinitions of his role and for forming new individual and institutional role sets. Many

2

discussions of role analysis assume a relatively rigid pattern of role set membership for any particular position. Traditional "counter others" will continue to negotiate social bargains with the principal. He does have considerable lattitude to modify many of these relationships. How much lattitude he has is in part dependent upon how well he understands the total pattern of claims upon him -- his own bargaining power and that of each group in his traditional role set, and the extent to which he can convince others that there are advantages in redefining his role as liaison, interpreter, and translator between the school and its institutional role set. Role analysis as generally defined, explains why roles are as they are rather than as a model of how they can be. Concepts of role change must be developed if the above assumptions about appropriate change are to be facilitated.

If a central role of the secondary school principal is to facilitate channels of two-way communication between the school and its institutional role set, teachers and students will also become active participants in the communication system. The principal becomes a leader and facilitator for the establishment of interpersonal contacts between students and professional personnel in the school and personnel in its institutional role set. The principal's role is also that of stimulating direct lines of two-way communication between individuals of the school and the school's role set rather than to be only a translator of information in the various institutions.

Persons recruited and selected for the principalship must possess the attitudes, orientation, and experiences consistent with this larger secondary school leadership function. Patterns of recruitment and selection can stress either the maintenance or change of the secondary school system. Present patterns favor persons who have been relatively successful both as students and teachers in the traditional stable system. An additional handicap for the principalship as an innovator is that the general requirements for his selection -- such as three years of successful teaching experience -- are the very experiences which associate him with internal groups which do not generally provide rewards and reinforcements for making changes.

In accordance with the principal's role proposed here, young men and women must be recruited who are flexible, who possess the capacity to serve as change agents and who can develop a climate in which change is rewarded. Also, they must be informed about the broad concepts of culture, social institutions, and the motivation of people. They should have first-hand knowledge of and experience in institutions included in the school's institutional role set. If the role of principal is to change significantly, recruitment and selection must also change.

The purpose of preparation programs for the secondary school principalship is to teach qualified candidates the skills of role set identification, re-education of tracitional role set members, identification of purposes, directions, and problems of the school's institutional role set and of interpretation of information about programs, processes, and content of the school to its institutional role set. Programs for the preparation of secondary school principals have tended to be maintenance oriented rather than innovative or change oriented. The content for preparation concentrates on the current operation of the system with modification based upon internally developed models. Change is usually limited to teaching more effectively what has traditionally been taught. Current preparation includes experiences, simulated instruction, cases, and internships based on "accepted" practices. Prospective principals are over-taught about appropriate behavior in the current system.

On the basis of the rationale set forth here, the preparation program for the principalship should include: broad studies of the culture in which the secondary school functions, the institutions within our culture and their relationships to the schools, basic principles of the process of education, and internship experiences within a number of cultural institutions rather than the school alone.

The central purpose for continuing education is that of support and reinforcement for the secondary school principal as an interpreter, translator, re-educator, and innovator. A secondary purpose is to keep him abreast of new knowledge and help him develop new skills.

Role analysis of the principal indicates that innovations are initiated, maintained, and made possible by high levels of support and reinforcement. When innovations fail to occur or to continue, it is because the cost is much greater to those involved than are the rewards. There is a dirth of support systems for innovations in the schools. Interviews with principals both in the United States and abroad indicate little evidence that state departments of education or universities provide effective support for innovative programs. In the absence of support and reinforcement for change, traditional patterns of behavior predominate.

Within the framework herein outlined, continuing education is an integral part of recruitment, selection, and preparation. Continuing education is used to express strong support to the principal who initiates and interprets administrative behavior consistent with the assumptions herein outlined.

Said another way, continuing education in this context makes it possible for change specialists to become powerful counter others to the principal. To serve effectively in this capacity, the specialist becomes a counsellor and partner to the principal in his innovative actions.

If the institutions of higher education are, first, to be effective in meeting the major purposes of continuing education -- that of reinforcing the principal as innovator -- then the second -- that of seeking new knowledge and learning new skills -- follows naturally and logically.

Role analysis provides a framework not only to explain the current role definitions of the secondary school principal but also to modify the role. The position developed here is that role theory analysis while not necessarily a change model has within its structure a rationale and potential model for change.

CHAPTER V -- ROLE THEORY

CONCLUSIONS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

The results of an eighteen-month role analytical study of the secondary school principalship is reported in this document. The purpose of the study was not only to adapt role theory as a study framework for American principals but also to modify and expand the theory where desirable. So that the model may be applicable across cultural lines and that the theory can be tested in various systems, the study included secondary school principals and headmasters from countries of the United States, New Zealand, four states in Australia, Hong Kong, England, Scotland and Ireland.

It was originally believed that role analytical instruments utilized in noneducational institutions could be readily adopted for schools and principals but it was found that this was not the case. In the judgment of the investigator, available research design and instrumentation generally lacks consistency with the total theory. Therefore, emphasis in this study has been on the development of a number of role theory elements for secondary educational administration within the role context.

This theory translation phase, along with other necessary developmental steps, is believed necessary before designing more specific depth studies within the role concept. First, as indicated above, continued effort is necessary to firm up the theory as a useful analytical device for educational administration. A part of the problem is the yet loose structure of portions of the theory. There is need both to sharpen presently included concepts and to develop appropriate extensions of the theory. The concept of institutional role sets introduced in Chapter IV is considered a theory extension.

Another part of the problem is that of translating the theory to education and to educational administration in particular. While the model has been used for certain research in these fields, the task of a comprehensive translation has only been initiated in this project. Preliminary research revealed no other similar effort.

Second, considerable more role theory-based case material is needed concerning school organization and administrative behavior. While existing case materials may be useful, the "holistic" nature of the theory requires that case material be collected within the theory framework. One purpose of this study was to collect such materials on schools and school administration across cultural lines.

Third, careful attention must be given to the development of taxonomies growing from the theory and from the theory based case material. The postulates outlined in Chapter IV may be viewed as statements from which such hypotheses can be generated. The complex interrelations of the theory require that studies be designed and analytical procedures be developed to treat a number of interacting variables simultaneously.

Fourth is to test through multi-variable instruments relevant concepts about administrative behavior. Data from the study will feed back into the theory and re-initiate the above four phases.

Two atypical research techniques for this type of study were borrowed and introduced in the study. First, the hypothesis formulation interview procedure was utilized. While an interview framework was carefully developed and tested, the specific questions asked were couched in hypothetical statements for explanation. During interviews, this procedure was found to be especially helpful in maintaining an open attitude to formulate new relevant but unplanned hypotheses. This helped in guiding interviews around hypotheses adequately explored with other subjects in each particular culture.

The second approach was to use what Glaser[1] calls "grounded theory" as a means for expanding the theory through the use of data collected. Glaser takes the position that highly useful theory can be generated from data just as data can be used to test hypotheses. Institutional role sets were conceived as a result of applying data in this way.

Related Activities

In addition to the major purpose of theory development, a number of auxiliary activities have grown out of this project.

First, the investigator is in the process of developing a teaching system based upon role theory. The plan includes a series of approximately two hundred fifty 35mm slides and synchronized tape script. The comprehensive audio-visual system will integrate the most prominent theories of organization, personality, and communication from the behavioral sciences; student exercises, discussion devices, and self analysis instruments; and auxiliary films which elaborate and extend various central concepts of the system. Also, it will be designed to provide a framework and departure points from which behavioral scientists such as psychologist, sociologist, anthropologist, and political scientist can make unique meaningful contributions.

Second, tentative drafts of four articles have been designed for different audiences. One article is written for the practitioner in secondary administration; one is designed for the general scholar in education; one discusses the study on a comparative educational level; and the last is a technical article for the behavioral scientist interested in role theory.

---

[1] Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

Third, as a result of the foreign study, the investigator developed a great interest in the educational values of greater interaction between professors and students across cultural lines. As a result of the contacts made through this study, a professor from the University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, is to be a member of a University of Nebraska staff team in teaching a block-of-time program in educational administration. Also, efforts are being made to recruit select students in educational administration from other English-speaking countries.

Fourth, the project provided the opportunity for the investigator to build a strong background in the area studied. He will continue to keep up with the literature in this area and contribute to the field. He is in an excellent position to serve a special role theory function in the general field of educational administration.

Two types of continuing research effort will be pursued. The first will be concerned with United States education and educational administration. The second will be international cooperatively designed models which will include studies conducted by researchers serving in the various countries included in this study.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Two interview schedules were designed as guides for collecting data needed for the study. The purpose for the first schedule was to gather pertinent general data about a number of cultural, societal and educational organizational variables. While this portion of the study was not intended to be exhaustive, it was structured to gather basic general knowledge of the culture. This was done through interviews with both educators and non-educators. Included among educators were college professors, central agency personnel, secondary school teachers, and principals. This schedule was used until little new or different data were received.

The second group of questions was designed for collecting role data about secondary principals. For the purpose of this exploratory study, it proved effective to keep interviews with principals "free wheeling", with only occasional questions to insure coverage of the necessary content. No attempt was made to explore questions in the order given. As the investigator became more knowledgeable about the culture, society, and the system's organization and as he gained experience in interviewing this particular group, it was possible to devote more of the two-hour sessions to the least understood areas of the interview.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I

CULTURAL, SOCIETAL, AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

How is education governed in your country -- unit size? population? number of students? What type of administrative structure operates in the unit? Are instructional and administrative functions unified or separated at the unit level? At other levels? Is the unit's chief administrator an educator? If not, what qualifications must he have? Does he work with an official board? Is the board appointed or elected? If appointed, by whom? What is the board's scope of responsibility?

How is education financed? State level? Unit level? Both? What formula is used in financing various schools in the unit? Who pays teachers? Are they on a single salary schedule for the entire state?

Who hires and assigns teachers? Can teachers be released from their positions? If so, how? Under what conditions will teachers be transferred from school to school? How do teachers' salaries, work conditions, fringe benefits and overall prestige compare with those of other professions?

How are students assigned to the various schools in the educational unit? Application? Districts? What types of secondary education are available for students? What occupational opportunities are there for students who do not finish secondary school?

What percentage of all students in the unit attend private schools? Religious schools? Does the state provide financial aid for religious schools? If so, how much? To what extent are religious schools supervised by the state?

Are teachers evaluated by a staff outside the school unit? If so, how? By whom? What are the rewards for being favorably evaluated?

What process is used for the evaluation of students? Are students evaluated by external or internal evaluators? What are the consequences of either passing or failing external examinations?

How is higher education organized? Who may attend? What percentage of those completing secondary school go to college? What percentage of those entering finish college? How is higher education financed for the students?

How are teachers prepared? What are the requirements for entry into preparation programs? How do programs differ for various levels, school types, and content areas?

What are the major themes of the larger society? What major problems are revealed through the press? Through visits with the man on the street? What is the level of technological development? What are the aspirations of people?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE II

THE ROLE OF THE SECONDARY PRINCIPAL

How were you hired for this position? Who were involved in the decision? Who outside the official appointment body influenced the decision? Can you be dismissed from your principalship? What is the process for dismissing principals? Under what kinds of circumstances would principals be dismissed? Do you know of principals who have been dismissed?

Who is your immediate superordinate? How often do you meet with him? As an individual or as a group? How frequently do you receive directions from him? What is the nature of directives? What type of problems do you check out with him? What kinds of directives from his office inhibit what you think you should be doing as principal? You likely view some things about the school differently from your superordinate. What are some of these? To what extent do you feel that you can be independent from the central office? To what extent can the chief unit administrator hurt you in case of serious disagreement? How can he help you?

What organizational arrangements are there in your school for working with teachers? What responsibilities do your assistants have with teachers? How about department heads? If I were a teacher in your school and had a grievance, what would be the appropriate way to handle it? What is the process for employing new teachers? What part do you have in the employment of new teachers? How are teachers evaluated? What formal part do you have in the evaluation process? Informal part? On what kinds of things do you and teachers disagree? Examples? How do you deal with these disagreements? In what ways do you wish teachers would be different than they are now? How do you think they would like for you to be different? In what ways do you think they disagree with you? To what extent do teachers in your school have support from a teachers union?

What organizational arrangements are there in your school for working with students? What arrangements are there for students to express their opinions about the way the school is operated? Do you have a formal student government organization? If so, how does it operate? Who sponsors it? When and in what ways are you involved directly with these student groups? What types of problems do student representatives bring to school officials? Examples? On what issues are there disagreements between students and teachers? Students and yourself? Do you have discipline problems with students? What kinds? Under what circumstances do you expel students? Examples? Who makes the decision about which students will be admitted to your school? How are these decisions made? How selective can you be?

What types of contacts do you have with parents? Does your school have a formal organization for parents? If so, what does the group do? To what extent can parents bring pressure on you directly? Indirectly, through some other individual or group? Does this happen? Example?

To what extent do you share the details of your job with your wife? What is her reaction to problems you encounter in your work? To what extent do you find conflict between expectations at home and your work?

To whom do you go with difficult problems associated with your work? Other principals? Your superordinate? A non-educator?

At times all of us feel that we are in the "middle" of two or more groups such that an action will please one but displease the other. Can you give examples of situations in which you feel you are in the middle? Examples? In these examples, what did you do to resolve the conflict?

We assume that we are all under stress. What sets of conditions within your work are most stressful? Examples? How do you deal with stress? Have you encountered any physical problems as a result of stress? What happened?

In what clubs or groups do you participate outside of school? Who are in these groups? Do these groups often discuss educational issues?

How did you become a principal? If you had your choice, are there occupations outside of education which you would prefer to your present role? What positions? Are there other positions in education which you would prefer to the one you now occupy? If so, what?

APPENDIX B

LISTING OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND THEIR LOCATIONS

Principals and Headmasters:

Bob Johnson, Shawnee Mission South, Shawnee Mission, Kansas.

Marlin Welsh, North High, Shawnee Mission, Kansas.

Fred Addis, Southeast High School, Wichita, Kansas.

Vernon Kirby, East High School, Wichita, Kansas.

Owen Henson, Topeka West High School, Topeka, Kansas.

Glen Burkett, Topeka High School, 800 West Tenth Street, Topeka, Kansas.

William Medley, Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Kansas.

Cyril R. Bradwell, Wellington High School, Private Bag, Wellington, New Zealand.

Dudley G. L. Hughes, Onslow College, Burma Road, Johnsonville, Wellington, New Zealand.

Neil Leckie, Bennington Primary School, Wellington, New Zealand.

Terence Richard Hitchings, Riccarton High School, Curletts Road, Christchurch, New Zealand.

William J. A. Brittenden, Aranui High School, Shortland Street, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Headmaster, Queenstown Primary and High School, Queenstown, New Zealand.

Kevin Patrick O'Conner, Wavell State High School, Brae Street, Wavell Heights, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Alfred Gray, Canley Vale High School, Prospect Road, Canley Vale, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Mrs. Lorna G. Collin, Moorefield Girls' High School, Princes Highway, Kogarah, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Victor G. Honour, Cordina State High School, Lynnegrove Avenue, Corinda, Brisbane, Austrlia.

Roy A. Barnes, Kew High School, Burke Road, East Kew, Victoria, Australia.

Albert Edward Murdoch, Burwood High School, Burwood Highway, Burwood, Victoria, Australia.

Headmaster Cash, Armidale Boys School, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia.

Headmaster, Armidale High School, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia.

Murray Yaxley, Rosetta High School, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

Terry Chamberlein, Queen Elizabeth School, Sai Yee St-Kowloon, Hong Kong.

Headmaster, Rome High School, Rome, Italy.

Headmaster Magahy, Kings Hospital School, Dublin, Ireland

Headmistress Sister Jude, Lordto Convent School, Fox Rock, Dublin, Ireland.

Edward Rossiter, Clogher Road Vocational School, Crumlin, Dublin, Ireland

Robert Corbett, Piasley Grammar School, Glasgow, Scotland.

Headmaster Wallace, Glenwood Comprehensive School, Glasgow, Scotland.

Headmistress Agett, Eveline Lowe Primary School, Marlborough Grove, London S.E.1, England.

Bryan Allen, William Morris School, Gainsford Road, Walthamstow, London, England.

Headmaster Conway, Jewish Free Comprehensive School, Camden Road, London, England.

Tom John, Tower Hill County Primary, Moore Avenue, Witney, Oxford, England.

Institutions of Higher Education:

Christ College, Christchurch, New Zealand.

University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand.

Armidale Teachers College, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia.

University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia.

University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Queensland Teachers College, Brisbane, Australia.

Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Monash University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

Advanced College of Education, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.

Glasgow University, Glasgow, Scotland.

Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow, Scotland.

Edinburgh College, Edinburgh, Scotland.

London Institute of Education, University of London, London, England.

Governmental Education Authorities:

Department of Primary Education, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Department of Secondary Education, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Department of Education, Napier, New Zealand.

Wellington Education Board, Wellington, New Zealand.

Department of Education, Auckland, New Zealand.

New South Wales Department of Education, Sydney, Australia.

Victoria Department of Education, Melbourne, Australia.

Tasmania Department of Education, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

Department of Education, Hong Kong.

Educational Planning Division, Ministry of Education, Bangkok, Thailand.

Ireland Department of Education, Dublin, Ireland.

Education Authority, Glasgow, Scotland.

Department of Education, Glasgow, Scotland.

England Department of Education and Science, London, England.

Other Agencies:

Department of Statistics, Government of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

Schools Council, London, England.

Center for Curriculum Renewal, London, England.

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

References

Banton, Michael. *Roles*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Berger, Peter L. *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963.

Biddle, Bruce, et. al. *Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions*. Vol. D - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Columbia: Social Psychology Laboratory, the University of Missouri, January, 1962.

Biddle, Bruce. *Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict and the Role of the Teacher*. Volume B - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Columbia: Social Psychology Laboratory, the University of Missouri, June, 1961.

Bills, Robert E. *An Assessment of Role Change*. West Virginia Department of Education and West Virginia County School Superintendents, 1959 to 1960. West Virginia: Department of Education, 1961.

Culbertson, Jack, Paul Jacobson, and Theodore Reller. *Administrative Relationships: A Casebook*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius. *The Biological Basis of Human Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Dodd, Peter C. *Role Conflicts of School Principals*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1965.

Frank, A. G. "Administrative Role Definition and Social Change," *Human Organization*, Vol. 22, pp. 238-242, 1964.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh, Scotland: University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Center, 1958.

Goode, W. J. "A Theory of Role Strain," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 483-496, 1960.

Gross, Neil. *The Role of the Elementary Junior High and Senior High School Principal*. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1960-63.

Griffith, Daniel. *Administrative Theory*. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1959.

Henry, Jules. *Culture Against Man*. West Minister, Maryland: Random House, 1963.

Kahn, Robert L., Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, and J. Diedrick Snoek. *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Linton, Ralph. *The Study of Man*. New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936.

Mead, G. H. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, C. W. Morris, editor, 1934.

Merton, R. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957, second edition.

Moore, Holles. "A Report on CPEA," *Studies in School Administration*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, 1957.

Neidt, Charles O., Brian C. Arnold, and James L. Sheard. *Development and Evaluation of a Selection Interviewing Technique*. The American Society for Personnel Administration.

Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory," *Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume I*. Editor, Gardner Lindzey, 2 vols. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.

Selye, Hans. *The Stress of Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Smith, Ernest. *American Youth Culture*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Sweitzer, Robert E. *Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals*. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, January, 1963.

Watts, Alan W. *Psychotherapy, East and West*. Pantheon Books, Inc., 1961.

Bibliography

Adams, S. "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance," *Social Forces*, Vol. 32, pp. 16-22, 1953.

Alpren, Morton. *The Development and Validation of an Instrument used to Ascertain a School Principal's Pattern of Behavior*. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, 1954.

Backman, C. W., P. F. Secord, and J. R. Pierce. "Resistance to Change in the Self-Concept as a Function of Consensus among Significant Others," *Sociometry*, Vol. 26, pp. 102-111, 1963.

Bar-Yosef, R., and E. O. Schild. "Pressures and Defenses in Bureaucratic Roles," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 71, pp. 665-673, May, 1966.

Bates, A. P., and J. S. Cloyd. "Towards the Development of Operations for Defining Group Norms and Member Roles," *Sociometry*, Vol. 19, pp. 26-39, 1956.

Bates, F. L. "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," *Social Forces*, Vol. 34, pp. 313-321, 1956.

Becker, H. S. "Schools and Systems of Social Status," *Phylon Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 159-170, 1955.

Bible, B. L. and J. D. McComas. "Role Consensus and Teacher Effectiveness," *Social Forces*, Vol. 42, pp. 225-232, 1963.

Biddle, B. J., J. P. Twyman, and E. F. Rankin, Jr. "The Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice," *School Review*, Vol. 70, pp. 191-206, 1962.

Bidwell, Charles E. "Administration and Teacher Satisfaction," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 37, pp. 285-288, April, 1956.

Bidwell, C. E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 29, pp. 41-47, 1955.

Bidwell, C. E. "Some Effects of Administrative Behavior: A Study in Role Theory," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 163-181, 1957.

Brookover, W. B. "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 29, pp. 2-13, 1955.

Brooks, E. "What Successful Executives Do," *Personnel*, Vol. 32, pp. 210-225, 1955.

Brubaker, Lowell K. "New Vistas in Principal-Faculty Relationships -- Through Faculty Meetings," *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, pp. 54-72, September, 1962.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "The School as a Social System," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 22, pp. 41-50, 1952.

Chase, F. S., and E. G. Guba. "Administrative Roles and Behavior," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 25, pp. 281-297, 1955.

Clark, Dean Oscar. *Critical Areas in the Administrative Behavior of High School Principals*. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1956.

Cooperative Research Program. The National Principalship Study. U. S. Office of Education and Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, pp. 1-21, April, 1961.

Cornell, Francis G. "Socially Perceptive Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 36, pp. 219-223, March, 1955.

Corwin, R. G. "Role Conception and Career Aspiration: A Study of Identity in Nursing," Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 2, pp. 69-86, 1961.

Couch, C. J. "The Use of the Concept 'Role' and its Derivatives in a Study of Marriage," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 20, pp. 353-357, November, 1958.

Coutu, W. "Role-Playing Versus Role-Taking: An Appeal for Clarification," American Sociological Review, Vol. 16, pp. 180-187, 1951.

Davis, J. A. "Status Symbols and the Measurement of Status Perception," Sociometry, Vol. 19, pp. 154-165, 1956.

Davis, K. "A Conceptual Analysis of Stratification," American Sociological Review, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 309-321, June, 1942.

Dyer, W. G. "Analyzing Marital Adjustment Using Role Theory," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24, pp. 371-375, November, 1962.

Egner, Joan Roos. "The Principal's Role: Cognitive Dissonance," Elementary School Journal, Vol. 67, No. 5, pp. 276-279, February, 1967.

Ehrlich, H. J., J. W. Rinehart, and J. C. Howell. "The Study of Role Conflict: Explorations in Methodology," Sociometry, Vol. 25, pp. 85-97, 1962.

Fishburn, C. E. "Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary School," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 55-59, 1962.

Getzels. J. W. "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 235-246, 1952.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, pp. 164-175, 1954.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, pp. 423-441, Winter, 1957.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 29, pp. 30-40, 1955.

Ghiselli, E. E., and R. Barthol. "Role Perceptions of Successful and Unsuccessful Supervisors," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 40, pp. 241-244, 1956.

Goldman, Harvey and James E. Heald. "Teachers' Need Patterns and the Administrator," National Association of Secondary School Principals, pp. 93-103, December, 1967.

Goode, W. J. "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role-Status Obligations," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 66, pp. 246-258, 1960.

Gordon, C. W. "The Role of the Teacher in the Social Structure of the High School," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 29, pp. 21-29, 1955.

Gullahorn, J. T. "Measuring Role Conflict," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61, pp. 299-303, 1956.

Gullahorn, J. T. and Jeanne E. Gullahorn. "Role Conflict and Its Resolution," Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 4, pp. 32-48, 1963.

Hartley, Ruth E. "Children's Concepts of Male and Female Roles," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 6, pp. 83-91, 1960.

Hartley, Ruth E. and A. Klein. "Sex-Role Concepts Among Elementary-School-Age Girls," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 21, pp. 59-64, February, 1959.

Harvey, O. J. "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Status Relations in Informal Groups," American Sociological Review, Vol. 18, pp. 357-367, 1953.

Harvey, O. J. and G. D. Beverly. "Some Personality Correlates of Concept Change Through Role Playing," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 125-129, 1961.

Harvey, O. J. and C. Consalvi. "Status and Conformity to Pressures in Informal Groups," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 182-187, 1950.

Hatfield, Agnes B. "An Experimental Study of the Self-Concept of Student Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 87-89, October, 1961.

Heim, Peggy. "Growing Tensions in Academic Administration," North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 244-251, Winter, 1968.

Hetzler, S. A. "Variations in Role-Playing Patterns Among Different Echelons of Bureaucratic Leaders," American Sociological Review, Vol. 20, pp. 700-706, 1955.

Hollander, E. P. "Conformity, Status, and Idiosyncrasy Credit," Psychological Review, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 117-127, 1958.

Jackson, Elton. "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 469-480, August, 1962.

Janis, I. L. and B. T. King. "The Influence of Role Playing on Opinion Change," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 49, pp. 211-218, 1954.

Kavolis, V. "Role Theory of Artistic Interest," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp. 31-37, 1963.

Kelly, H. H. and M. M. Shapiro. "An Experiment on Conformity to Group-Norms Where Conformity is Detrimental to Group Achievement," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 19, pp. 667-677, 1954.

Kenkel, W. F. and D. K. Hoffman. "Real and Conceived Roles in Family Decision Making," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 18, pp. 311-316, November, 1956.

Kitano, H. L. "Adjustment of Problem and Non-Problem Children to Specific Situations: A Study in Role Theory," *Child Development*, Vol. 33, pp. 229-233, 1962.

Knoff, W. F. "Role: A Concept Linking Society and Personality," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 117, pp. 1010-1015, May, 1961.

Lasswell, T. E. "The Perception of Social Status," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 45, pp. 170-174, 1961.

Lien, Ronald L. "Democratic Administrative Behavior," *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, pp. 31-38, March, 1964.

Lewis, D. J. "Stimulus, Response, and Social Role," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp. 119-127, 1959.

Lieberman, S. "The Effects of Changes in Roles on the Attitudes of Role Occupants," *Human Relations*, Vol. 9, pp. 385-402, 1956.

Linton, Ralph. "Role and Status," *The Cultural Background of Personality*, pp. 367-370, 1945.

Lippitt, Rosemary and Anne Hubbell. "Role Playing for Personnel and Guidance Workers: Review of the Literature with Suggestions for Application," *Group Psychotherapy*, Vol. 9, pp. 89-114, 1956.

Loomis, Charles P. "In Praise of Conflict and Its Resolution," *American Sociological Review*, Vol, 32, No. 6, pp. 875-877, December, 1967.

Lynn, D. B. "Learning Masculine and Feminine Roles," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 25, pp. 103-105, February, 1963.

Maccoby, Eleanor E. "Role-Taking in Childhood and Its Consequences for Social Learning," *Child Development*, Vol. 30, pp. 239-252, 1959.

Mack, R. W. "Occupational Determinateness: A Problem and Hypotheses in Role Theory," *Social Forces*, Vol. 35, pp. 20-25, 1956.

Mack, R. W. "Occupational Ideology and the Determinate Role," *Social Forces*, Vol. 36, pp. 37-44, 1957.

Mann, J. H. "Studies of Role Performance," *Genetic Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 64, pp. 213-307, 1961.

Mangus, A. R. "Role Theory and Marriage Counseling," *Social Forces*, Vol. 35, pp. 200-209, 1957.

Manwiller, L. V. "Expectations Regarding Teachers," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 26, pp. 315-354, 1958.

Mason, W. S. and N. Gross. "Intra-Occupational Prestige Differentiation: The School Superintendency," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 326-331, 1955.

Merton, R. K. "The Role-Set: Problems in Sociological Theory," *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 8, pp. 106-120, 1957.

Merton, Robert, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. "Problems and Prospects," *Sociology Today*, Vol. 2, pp. 413-419, 1959.

Miller, R. C. and A. S. Fremont, Jr. "The Prediction of Administrative Role Conflict Resolutions," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 7, pp. 143-160, 1962.

Moreno, J. L. "Role Theory and the Emergence of the Self," *Group Psychotherapy*, Vol. 15, pp. 114-117, 1962.

Moreno, J. L. "The 'United Role Theory' and the Drama," *Group Psychotherapy*, Vol. 15, pp. 253-254, 1962.

Olds, Victoria. "Role Theory and Casework: A Review of the Literature," *Social Casework*, Vol. 43, pp. 3-8, 1962.

Pellegrin, R. J. and F. L. Bates. "Congruity and Incongruity of Status Attributes Within Occupations and Work Positions," *Social Forces*, Vol. 38, pp. 23-28, 1959.

Rosen, H. "Managerial Role Interaction: A Study of Three Managerial Levels," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 30-34, 1961.

Rosenblatt, A. "Application of Role Concepts to the Intake Process," *Social Casework*, Vol. 43, pp. 8-14, 1962.

Sarbin, T. R. and V. L. Allen. "Role Enactment, Audience Feedback, and Attitude Change," *Sociometry*, Vol. 27, pp. 183-194, 1964.

Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 373-380, August, 1953.

Shapiro, Stewart B. "Some Aspects of a Theory of Interpersonal Contracts," *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 22, pp. 171-183, 1968.

Smith, E. E. "The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 55, pp. 213-217, 1957.

Smith, M. "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, pp. 185-192, 1943.

Snoek, Diedrick J. "Role Strain in Diversified Role Sets," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp. 363-372, 1966.

Southall, A. "An Operational Theory of Role," Human Relations, Vol. 12, pp. 17-34, 1959.

Spiegel, J. P. "The Resolution of Role Conflict Within the Family," Psychiatry, Vol. 20, pp. 1-16, 1957.

Steiner, I. D. and W. L. Field. "Role Assignment and Interpersonal Influence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 61, pp. 239-245, 1960.

Stouffer, S. A. "Role Conflict and Sanctioning Reference Groups," Social Research to Test Ideas. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Strauss, A. L. "The Learning of Roles and of Concepts as Twin Processes," Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 88, pp. 211-217, 1956.

Stryker, S. "Role-Taking Accuracy and Adjustment," Sociometry, Vol. 20, pp. 286-296, 1957.

Stuckert, R. P. "Role Perception and Marital Satisfaction--A Configurational Approach," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 25, pp. 415-419, November, 1963.

Thompson, J. D. "A Model for Viewing Organizational Conflict," Research in Educational Administration, pp. 109-116, January, 1962.

Turner, R. H. "Role Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61, pp. 316-328, 1956.

Twyman, J. P. and B. J. Biddle. "Role Conflict of Public School Teachers," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 55, pp. 183-198, 1963.

Videbeck, R. and A. P. Bates. "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," Sociometry, Vol. 22, pp. 1-11, 1959.

Wilson, B. R. "The Teacher's Role--A Sociological Analysis," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 13, pp. 15-32, 1962.

Wilson, Charles F. "Tension in High School Principals and Business Executives," National Association of Secondary School Principals, pp. 34-43, September, 1962.

Wolfe, D. M. and J. D. Snoek, "A Study of Tensions and Adjustment Under Role Conflict," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18, pp. 102-121, 1962.

APPENDIX D

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

Pages 6 and 7

. . . "discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research."

Reprinted from The Discovery of Grounded Theory by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss by permission of the Aldine Publishing Company. Copyrighted 1967. Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by the Aldine Publishing Company to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 10

. . . "Every society . . . can be viewed as a division of labor suited to its environment. Particular members are given their task to perform on behalf of the group. Norms as to proper behavior in given circumstances are established, and sanctions are developed to reward people for worthy conduct and punish them for deviations."

Reprinted from Roles by Michael Banton by permission of Basic Books, Inc. Copyrighted 1965.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by Basic Books, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 11

. . . ". . . a sort of reality agreed upon ad hoc by those who participate in it, or, more exactly, by those who do the defining of the situation. From the viewpoint of the individual participant this means that each situation he enters confronts him with specific expectations and demands of him specific responses to these expectations."

Reprinted from Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective by Peter L. Berger by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc. Copyrighted 1963.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by Doubleday & Company, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 11

"A second kind of interaction has been added . . . which marks role theory as a unique social, psychological formulization, namely, the interaction of role and self."

Reprinted from "Role Theory" in Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume I by Theodore R. Sarbin and edited by Gardner Lindzey by permission of Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. Copyrighted 1954.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 12

. . . ". . . as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other."

"Objective ambiguity is a condition in the environment; subjective or experienced ambiguity is a state of the person."

. . . "condition in which role senders (including the self as a role sender) hold compatible, legitimate expectations of the incumbent to perform a large number of tasks."

Reprinted from Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity by Robert Kahn, Donald Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, and J. Diedrick Snoek by permission of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Copyrighted 1964.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 15

. . . "a status as distinct from the individual who may occupy it is simply a collection of rights and duties. . . . A role represents the dynamic aspects of a status. . . . When (an individual) puts the rights and duties into effect, he is performing a role."

Reprinted from The Study of Man by Ralph Linton by permission of Appleton-Century Company, Inc. Copyrighted 1936.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by Appleton-Century Company, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Page 17

. . . "interdisciplinary theory in that its variables are drawn from studies of culture, society, and personality."

. . . ". . . role, the unit of culture; position, the unit of society; and self, the unit of personality"

Reprinted from "Role Theory" by Theodore Sarbin in Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume I edited by Gardner Lindzey by permission of Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. Copyrighted, 1954.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Pages 31 and 32

"For adult or child the family is the main center of role allocation and this assumes a key position in solutions of role strain. Most individuals must account to their families for what they spend in time, energy, and money outside of the family. . . . Consequently family relations form the most immediate and persistent set of interactions which are of importance in social control. . . . (The family) also becomes a vantage point from which to view one's total role system in perspective because it is a set of status obligations which change little from day to day and from which escape is difficult. Role alternatives can be evaluated against a fairly stable background. Consequently, other family members can and do give advice as to how to allocate energies from a secure center. Thus it is from this center that one learns the basic procedures of balancing role strains. . . . The intense sentiments within the family cushion individual strain by inducing each person to make concessions to give sympathy to the others. Of course, greater strain is experienced when they do not. These status rights and obligations then become role retreats or role escapes with demands which are felt to be less stringent."

Reprinted from "A Theory of Role Strain" in American Sociological Review by W. J. Goode. Copyrighted 1960.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by the American Sociological Review to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce ERIC documents. Reproduction by users of any copyrighted material contained in documents disseminated through the ERIC system requires permission of the copyright owner.